

A
JUST REPLY
TO
Mr. John Flavell's Arguments,
BY WAY OF
ANSWER
TO A
DISCOURSE

Lately Published, Entituled,

A SOLEMN CALL, &c.
WHEREIN

It is further plainly proved, That the Covenant made with Israel at Mount Sinai, as also the Covenant of Circumcision made with Abraham, whereon so much stress is laid for the Support of *Infants Baptism*, are no other than two several Editions of the Covenant of Works; and consequently, that no just Argument can thence be deduced for the Justification of that Practice.

Together, with a Reply to Mr. Joseph Whiston's Reflections on the forementioned Discourse, in a late small Tract of his, Entituled, *The right Method for the proving of Infants Baptism*. As also, a Reply to the several Propositions and Arguments by him insisted on in his Answer to Mr. Cox, whereby he pretends to have clearly and fully proved, That the Covenant of Circumcision established with Abraham, Gen. 17. 7. is the Covenant of Grace.

By PHILIP CART, a Lover of
Truth and Peace.

LONDON,

Printed for J. Harris at the Harrow in the poultry.



ADVERTISEMENT.

A *Confession of Faith*, put forth by the Elders and Brethren of many Congregations of Christians (Baptized upon Profession of their Faith) in *London*, and the Country. With an *Appendex* concerning *Baptism*. Approved of, and Recommended by the Ministers and Messengers of, and concerned for, upward of one hundred Baptised Congregations in *England* and *Wales* (denying *Arminianism*.)



1690
C 333
J

THE PREFACE TO

The Christian Reader.

I*T is well Noted by Mr. Whiston in his Preface to the Discourse which this gives Answer to; That there is a time coming, when the Fulness of the Gentiles shall come in, and the Deliverer shall come out of Zion, and turn away Ungodliness from Jacob: When all the Diversities of Opinion shall cease, and the Doctrin of the Gospel be taught in its Perfection, Purity, and Simplicity: Whereon, saith he, shall ensue, through the more plentiful pourings forth of the Spirit, a perfect Unity of Mind, Judgment, and Practice, in especial in the Worship of God among Saints; wherein shall consist no small Part of the Happiness and Glory of the Church. Whereunto he adds in the conclusion of his fore-mentioned Preface; That he cannot but hope the Day is now hastening, when the Spirit shall be more plentifully poured forth*

A 2. from

The P R E F A C E.

from on high, as the Issue whereof all Contests of this Nature shall cease, In which Hope and Expectation I do most heartily concur with him, though for the present so it is, that his Apprehensions and mine do greatly differ as to the matters in Controversie between us.

Indeed, were it not for this Hope, such is the Impurity, Defilement, and Corruption, that at present abounds in the World, in reference to God's Worship; and such is the Corruption also that prevails in the World, in respect of that truly Evangelical Doctrine and Faith, which was once delivered to the Saints, from whence an innumerable Troop of many other Sins, Miseries and Afflictions, do Invade us, that we have little reason to take any great Comfort in any long continuance here, but rather to be hastning our Preparations for that Blessed State of Serenity and Felicity that is above, into which, as no Unclean thing shall enter; so we shall there be Perfectly freed from all those Mistakes, Infirmities and Distractions, which do now prove so troublesome unto us, during our absence from that Heavenly Rest: But if God hath a design to set up his Son Jesus Christ in the World as King of Kings &

Lord

The P R E F A C E.

Lord of Lords, that his Name may be one, and his Glory one in all the Earth; and if God hath a design to make the place of his Feet Glorious in the midst of his Sanctuary; to pour forth of his Spirit, as Rivers of Water upon the Dry Ground, and as Floods upon the Thirsty Land; I say, if this be God's design, and if he shall thus be pleased to send forth the Plentiful Showers of his Heavenly Blessing, for the Refreshment of his Weary Heritage: This may justly make the future Prospect of a further continuance here, to be as desirable unto us, as it was unto Moses in like Circumstances that before he went hence, he might go over and see the Good Land that is beyond Jordan, that goodly Mountain and Lebanon.

*In the mean season, Christian Reader, so it is, that there are Two Eminent Men, whom I hope I may justly salute as my Christian Brethren, whom yet neverless I am forced to grapple with hand to hand, both at once, before and behind, in the open Field, and that at Sword's Point. God knows whose Sword is longest, and sharpest; or comes nearest to the Scripture Standard, theirs or mine; that must be left to the Judgment of the Christian Spectators. But
what?*

The P R E F A C E.

whatever that may be, I am not without hopes, that the Supream Judg of Heaven and Earth will some way or other Umpire the present Controversie betwixt us, as he did in Job's Case : Else there is little likelihood, how clearly soever the Truth may be stated in the present Discourse, that this, or any other Discourse of this Nature, will put an Issue to the present Dispute, as long as Men have a Disputing Faculty left them.

The Reader may easily perceive the necessity that lies upon me to Endeavour the Defence and Vindication of those Important Truths contained in the Discourse by me lately Published, Entituled, A Solemn Call, &c. This Discourse of mine is now by these Men violently Assaulted ; but with what Justice and Equity, with what Christian Candor and Integrity, is left unto the Reader's Judgment. Mr. Flavell tells me indeed in his present Reply, that he is Resolved to Contend with me in Friendship and Courtesie, Alexander like, when he intended to fall on Taxiles an Indian Prince. But as there was little of Justice in Alexander's Enterprize ; whatever Honesty, or Courtesie, was pretended by him : So neither is there in Mr. Flavell's, if he thinks to be-

reave

The P R E F A C E.

reave Men of their Reason by his Martial Achievements.

However, this is certain, the matters in Controversy betwixt us, are of the highest Importance; that is, Concerning the true Nature and Difference betwixt the two Covenants, that of Works, and that of Grace; than which there can be nothing of greater Consequence to us, whether in reference to the Issues of this World, or that that is to come, whatever Mr. Flavell's Opinion is concerning them. He blames me, indeed, for affirming in the Conclusion of my former Discourse; that these things will be found at length to have been of highest concernment unto us: For it is of those things I am there speaking. I do indeed therein also comprehend the matters of God's Worship, whereof Baptism is no small part. And if the Purity of the Gospel Doctrine and Worship, be not things of highest concernment unto us, let the Christian Reader judge.

To conclude, I am not without hopes, that in a little time the Mystery of God in this Respect, will be finished, as he hath declared to his Servants the Prophets; when the Temple of God shall be opened in Heaven, wherein shall be seen the Ark of his Testament.

And

The P R E F A C E.

And whatever Lightnings and Voices, Thundrings, or Earthquakes, may be Concomitant herewith, to be sure the Issue must needs be Comfortable and Glorious to all that are upright in Heart.

Finally, When the Pure and Uncorrupted Doctrin of the Grace of God in Jesus Christ shall be universally preached; and all Corrupt Mixtures in Gods Worship shall be totally abolished; then, and not till then, may we expect the Holy City, New Jerusalem coming down from God out of Heaven, prepared as a Bride adorned for her Husband; having the Glory of God, and her Light most precious, clear as Christal. When there shall be no more Curse. But the Throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his Servants shall serve him. In the Hope and Expectation of which day, and state of Blessedness, I take leave to Subscribe my self,

Christian Reader,

Thy Servant for Christ's Sake,

Philip Cary.

PART.

PART I.

Containing, a *Just* and a *Sober Reply*, to
Mr. Flavell's Arguments, by way of
Answer to the forementioned Discourse.

S E C T. I.

MR. *Flavell* tells me, in the Manuscript Copy he sent me, of his present Reply, now in Print, That his proper Province at this time, is to Examine and Defend the Foundation, on which our Divines have built the Right of Infants Baptism, *viz.* Gods Covenant with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. which, saith he, is the Covenant of Grace, the same we are now under. The Question hereon being the *Articulus stantis vel Cadentis Paedobaptismi*. And that if I can make good my Thesis, that it was not a Gospel Covenant, but now abolished, I have certainly destroy'd the principal Fort which defended the claim of our Infants to the priviledges of the Covenant. He now tells me in his printed Reply, That his proper Province is to discover that part of the Foundation, meaning, *Abraham's Covenant*, whence our

Divines deduce the Right of Infants Baptism.

So that I perceive, he is not fixed in his Mind, whether *Abraham's Covenant* be an Entire or Partial Foundation onely? Sometimes it seems to him to be the sole Foundation of the Practice of Infants Sprinkling; else the Question thereon cannot be the *Articulus stantis vel Cadentis Pædobaptismi*. Otherwhile he is loath to venture it singly upon that Bottom. However it be, of this I am sure, Every Plant which our Heavenly Father hath not planted, shall in due season be rooted up. And I suppose, a little time will shew, whether the present practice of Infants Sprinkling be not to be deservedly reckoned among that number.

That no small stress is, and hath been laid upon the Arguments drawn from that Covenant, by the Assertors of Infants Baptism, for the justification of that practice, cannot be denied. How the *Sinai Covenant* came to be hooked into the Question, Mr. *Flavel* himself hath accounted for, p. 133. of his fore-mentioned printed Reply, as being occasioned by himself. Accordingly he tells me, in his Manuscript Copy, that he is now to give his Reasons, why he thinks I have not proved, that the *Sinai Covenant* was a Covenant of Works. As also, why he thinks I have not proved *Abraham's Covenant*, Gen. 17. to be a Covenant of Works; nor that the New Covenant is Absolute, and without Condition.

only. In his printed Reply the Expression is a little varied; for there he saith, that that which I affirm, and he is to disprove, is, that the *Sinai* Covenant, and *Abraham's* Covenant are no Gospel Covenants; which is the same in effect with the other: For if neither of them be Gospel Covenants, they must needs be both a Covenant of Works.

He begins, p. 10. of his printed Reply, with the *Sinai* Covenant; which I affirm to be a Covenant of Works; the very same for substance with that made with *Adam* in Innocency. For the clearing up of which Proposition, and to prevent any further Disputes thereon, as to the true State of the Question. By the *Sinai* Covenant, I understand the whole Complex Body of the Law, as it was delivered on *Mount Sinai*: The Moral part whereof, contained a clear and plain manifestation of the Law, written in the Heart of Man at the first. The addition of the Ceremonial Precepts whereunto, makes no alteration, as to the true Nature or Essence of that Covenant: For so long as this Rule is retained, *Do this and live*, as it was in respect of the whole Body of the Law, it is still the same Covenant with *Adam's*, for the Substance or Essence of it, and is accordingly represented to us in the Scripture under the Denomination of the First, or Old Covenant. The whole Complex Body of the *Sinai* Covenant, therefore, is that which

I affirm to be a Covenant of Works; the very same for substance, with that made with *Adam* in Paradise. Now this Assertion of mine, you tell me, is attended with many gross Absurdities.

For first, say you, from hence it follows, that either *Moses*, and all *Israel* were damned; there being no Salvation possible to be attained by that first Covenant; or else, that there was a Covenant of Grace at the same time, running Paralel with the Covenant of Works: And so the Elect People of God were at the same time under the First, as a Covenant of Death and Condemnation, and under the Second as a Covenant of Grace and Justification. And this latter, you tell me, I am forced upon; which, you say, is attended with many false and absurd Conclusions: For during Life, they must hang midway betwixt Justification and Condemnation. And after Death they must necessarily hang between Heaven and Hell. And so at last (say you) we have found the *Limbus Patrum*, which the Papists so earnestly contend for; and must send *Moses* and all Gods People to *Purgatory* (so your Manuscript Copy runs.) How to avoid these Absurdities, you say, you see not, according to my dangerous Concession.

Reply, By way of Answer hereunto, I must tell you, Sir, That I should greatly admire, if you your self be not sensible, that the same pretended Absurdities do attend, and fall full as
tell

heavily, and indeed, a great deal more, on your Doctrine than on mine: Since that which I affirm to be two distinct and essentially different Covenants, to wit, Perfect doing, with the consequent Curse upon the Non-performance; and believing in Christ, unto Life and Salvation, you are forced, according to your Doctrine, to comprise in one and the same Covenant. And then I would willingly know, if you, or any other Man, can free the present Point, as it is thus stated by your selves, from the very self same Absurdities you would fasten on me. If you can, you will with the same breath discharge me, and that far more effectually, than you can with any shadow of Reason, do it for your selves. For your Conviction, therefore, in this respect.

In the first place; It cannot be denied, but that the Scriptures do plainly inform us, that both Moses, and all Gods People, during the former Administration, were all of them under the Law, or Sinai Covenant. For with them all was that Covenant made, and under it they were. *Exod. 24. 17. Deut. 4. 13. 27. 26. Yea, they were absolutely under it; Gal. 3. 23. Before Faith came* (saith the Apostle) *we were kept under the Law, shut up unto the Faith which should afterward be revealed.* So, *Gal. 4. 4. When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a Woman, made under the Law, to redeem them that were under the Law.*

Law, that we might receive the Adoption of Sons. And the Scriptures do equally assure us, that as many as are under the Law, they are under the Curse: For it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the Book of the Law, to do them. Gal. 3. 10. unto which all the People were to say, Amen. Deut. 27. 26. These things you cannot but acknowledge, as being no other than plain Scripture Propositions; when yet, at the same time, you must needs grant, that all Gods Elect, among that People, were under a pure Covenant of Gospel Grace, whereby they were saved. Now, either it was the same, or they were two different Covenants, that had these essentially different Properties. If they were two, then you grant my main Proposition, that Gods People were then under two distinct, and essentially different Covenants. If you say it was the same, then see what follows: For if the whole Body of the *Israelites* then were, as they were, under the Law, and consequently, under its Curse: Can a Man be under the Curse of the Law, and yet at the same time, and as the fruit of the same Covenant, be under the Blessing of the Gospel? Doth the same Fountain, at the same time, send forth bitter Waters and sweet? Or is it possible, that the same Covenant, should at the same time be a Covenant of Faith in Christ Jesus; when both God himself, *Moses*, and *Paul* do plainly represent it to us, as a Covenant of Works,

Works, requiring, strict, universal, and perfect Obedience, under pain of the Curse, Condemnation and Death?

Indeed, I cannot but wonder, how you hold and hug a Principle that tusts you naturally into such gross Absurdities: For do you not see what follows from hence by unavoidable Consequence? For according to this Principle, you must hold, that *Moses* and all Gods Elect People in *Israel*, who were under that Covenant, and with whom it was made, must, during their Life, hang midway between Justification and Condemnation; and after Death, between Heaven and Hell? This you charge upon my Doctrine; but do you not see that the same thundring Canon, *Limbus Patrum, Purgatory*, and the like, which, with such a full Mouth you discharge at me, comes thundring back again upon your self? Yea, do you not see that the very same Absurdities are far more justly and truly chargeable on your Doctrine than on mine? For it may be reasonably concluded, according to my Principles, that how harsh or dreadful soever the Terms or Conditions of the Legal Covenant were, to those that were under it (as *Moses* and the whole Body of the *Israelites* then were) yet the Grace of the Gospel Covenant far superseded, and was, by far, more Victorious, Powerful, and Efficacious: For as the Law entered that the offence might abound; so (saith the Apostle) where Sin hath abounded

Grace did much more abound. And if by one man's offence, death reigned by one, much more they which receive abundance of Grace, and of the gift of Righteousness, shall reign in life by one Jesus Christ: Rom. 5. 17. 20. But what shall relieve when those two opposite, and quite contrary conditions, Faith and Works, and the consequent fruits of either Justification and Condemnation shall be compriz'd, or rather, confounded together in one and the same Covenant? Shall they fly from one part of the Covenant to the other, from the Bitter Waters to the sweet Waters of the same Fountain, for Relief? This sounds harsh, Is it not therefore much more congruous and suitable to Reason, as well as also to the constant Analogy of the Christian Faith and Doctrine, to affirm as *Paul* doth, that these are the two Covenants, and that the Sinner being scared with the dread and terrors of the Legal Covenant, is forced thereby to have recourse unto the Gospel Covenant for succour, which the Spirit of God hath assured us, is of such a superabounding Nature, for Comfort and Salvation, above what the other contained for Death and Condemnation?

Besides, God doth plainly tell the *Israelites*, that he would remember his Covenant with them in the days of their youth; I say, His Covenant in opposition and contradistinction to their own, before spoken of; And then (saith he) thou shalt remember thy ways and be ashamed, when

when thou shalt receive thy Sisters, and I will give them to thee for Daughters; but not by thy Covenant; and I will establish my Covenant with thee, and thou shalt know that I am the Lord; Ezek. 16. 60, 61. Now what may we infer from hence, but plainly this, that there was a two-fold Covenant betwixt God and Israel; the one called theirs, the other Gods, yet both Gods Covenants; the first was called theirs, because they were required to perform the Conditions of it: the one a Covenant of Works, whereof Moses was the Mediatour, wherein themselves were immediately concerned to procure their own Salvation by their own Duties of Obedience, which was impossible, which was the true nature of the Sinai Covenant; Rom. 10. 5. Gal. 3. 10, 12. The other, a Covenant of Gospel Grace, which is wholly free and absolute; whereof Christ is the only Mediatour and Surety; Rom. 10. 6, 7, 8, &c. Heb. 8. 6, 7, &c. This is properly Gods Covenant; and this is the Covenant, saith God, that I will establish.

In short, the Scriptures do plainly assure us of two Covenants, the Legal and the Gospel, and that these two are essentially different, in respect of the terms of Life propounded in either. And the Scriptures do equally assure us, that no man is justified by the Law in the sight of God. This is evident, (saith the Apostle) and why? For the just shall live by Faith, and the Law is not of Faith.

~~The Lawman that doth them shall live with them.~~
On the contrary, you affirm, that the Law is
of Faith; yea, that it is a Covenant of Faith
in Christ Jesus. Now whom shall we believe,
whether ~~Paul~~ or you?

You affirm, that the Sinai Covenant was
purposely so dispensed, as to tender Life and
Happines upon two opposite and contrary
Conditions, Works and Faith. Perfect do-
ing and believing. The Apostle Paul, on the
other hand, affirms, That if it be by Grace,
then is it no more of Works, otherwise Grace is no
more Grace; and if it be of Works then is it no
more Grace; otherwise Work is no more Work.
So that we see the Scripture allows of no such
mixture, and shews us it is impossible
that the same Covenant should be so dispensed
as to tender Life and Happines upon two
such opposite and contrary Conditions. And
yet this Absurdity, all those must of necessity
run into, that will not allow the Sinai Co-
venant to be a Covenant of Works; and on
the contrary, affirm it to be a Gospel Cove-
nant, or a Covenant of Faith in Christ Jesus.

Besides, if the Law is a Covenant of Faith,
that is, a Gospel Covenant, we know that
the Covenant of Faith justifies all that are
in it, that is, all those who believe: For be-
ing justified by Faith we have peace with God,
through Jesus Christ our Lord; Rom. 5. 1. But
the Apostle doth expressly testify, That by the
deeds of the Law there shall be no flesh be justified in
God's

God's fight, *Rom. 3. 20.* And how is it then a Covenant of Faith, or a Gospel Covenant, as you affirm it is?

Again; If the Law is a Covenant of Faith, we know, that though many were justified under it, as *Moses* and the rest of the Elect then were; yet none were ever justified by it, or by virtue of it: *Rom. 3. 20.* And how is it then a Covenant of Faith?

Moreover, we know the Apostle calls it, *A ministration of Death and Condemnation; and contrary to us: And that which is therefore now done away, taken out of the way, and blotted out; 2 Cor. 3. 6, 7. Col. 2. 14.* which thundring Expressions of his, could not possibly be uttered, because the Jews had perverted the chief Design and Scope of it, as you affirm: For *Moses* himself calls it a Fiery Law that proceeded from God's right-hand; *Dent. 33. 2.* And God himself, in the very first Sanction of it, before the Jews could have perverted it, pronounceth a dreadful Curse upon every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the Book of the Law to do them. And 'tis evident, that from hence it is, and not from the Reason by you suggested, that the Apostle bestows the Epithites upon it he doth. And how is it then a Covenant of Faith? And if it is not a Covenant of Faith, it must needs be a Covenant of Works, there being no medium between these two.

Your

You severely, though unjustly, blame me for several Self Contradictions in my former Discourse; but why blame you not your self, for such frequent palpable Contradictions of the Divine Truth, contained in the word of Truth?

Yea, if the Law is indeed a Covenant of Faith, or a Gospel Covenant, as you affirm it is; how is it consistent with what your self have asserted, p. 326. of your Book, entituled, *The Method of Grace*. Where you are pleased to tell us; *That the Law required perfect working under the pain of a Curse, accepted of no short endeavours; admitted no Repentance, and gave no strength*. If you say that the Covenant of Faith, or the Gospel Covenant hath all these Properties, you contradict the whole Scope and Design of the Scriptures. If you cannot but acknowledge, as you must, that it can be no other than a Covenant of Works that hath all these Properties; then you are guilty of Self Contradiction; the same fault you blame in me, since you now pretend to have disproved my Assertion, that the Law could be no other than a Covenant of Works, or could be no Gospel Covenant.

Besides, do you not now positively assert, that there was Pardon upon Repentance in Moses his Covenant, which you endeavour largely to prove from the Promise mentioned, *Lev. 26.* affirming that it belongs to the Dispensation of the Law at Mount Sinai; which you say doth

doth contain in it self, without doubt, the fullest Relief a Sinner can desire, even Pardon of Sin. And yet do you not as positively assert in your forementioned Book, That the Law admitted no Repentance? If this be not a palpable Self-contradiction I know not what is.

But, Sir, I must tell you, that you are not only guilty of Self-contradiction in this Passage, but somewhat worse: For when you tell me, p. 10. of your Manuscript Copy, "That I am forced to grant, that there was Pardon on Repentance, both in *Moses's* Covenant and in *Adam's*, or the Conditionall Gospel Promise, *Lev. 26.* given at *Mount Sinai*, contains it; and yet afterward contradict my self, by affirming, that there was no Pardon on Repentance, in the one or the other: you abuse your Neighbour also. For in p. 179. of my former Discourse (which hath been so much canvast on this account). I only grant your Assertion, that God promised Pardon, *Lev. 26.* for the breach of *Moses* his Covenant; adding, that so it was in respect of *Adam's* Covenant also; else we had ben all undone for ever. But do I therefore say, that there was Pardon on Repentance in either of these Covenants? Is there not a palpable difference between my being forced to grant, as you affirm I do, That there was Pardon on Repentance in both these Covenants; and my Concession, that God promisseth

promiseth Pardon *in respect* of either of them. Do you not see that these two Assertions do widely differ as much as the *East* doth from the *West*?

Sir, I gave you warning of this before, when you and I spoke together upon this Subject; and yet you have had the Confidence to send your Manuscript Copy to me, so worded, as I have before related. And though you endeavour to extenuate the matter, and excuse your self as well as you can, in the latter end of your printed Reply, yet even there also, instead of mending, you greatly aggravate your fault, in your foregoing, newly fram'd Discourse about my p. 179. So that you seem resolved to cast dirt enough, right or wrong: And *aliquid adhaerebit*; some at least will stick, whether you disprove what I affirm, or no: But all men of Reason, will tell you, That this is no Christian way of answering Books: You ought rather to have answered my Arguments, whereby I have proved, that the *Sinai* Covenant could be no other than a Covenant of Works; and those whereby I have proved, that the Covenant of Circumcision was of the same stamp. But instead of answering any one of my Arguments, you fall upon pretended Absurdities, and Self-contradictions, which you fancy to your self may be found up and down in my Book. But alas, Sir, how easy is it to fancy Contradictions in Books, if a Critical Ad-

versary

versary do but let his Wits upon the Tenter-hooks, to study and find them out, and it may be where there are indeed none at all, only in the Mind of him who is ever solicitously desirous to make them appear to be such; if he cannot find them such; and that merely to spoil his Adversaries Reputation, thereby to advance his own, or the Cause he hath espoused.

In this respect it is obvious to all understanding Men, that the leaving out, addition, or misplacing but of one word, and sometimes of one Syllable in a Sentence, by him whose design it is to make it appear a Contradiction to what went before or follows after, will render it very Odd and Ridiculous. Many Instances whereof, as to your dealing thus, and worse with me, in sundry parts of your Reply, are sufficiently apparent. Let the following Particulars therefore serve as a Specimen, whereby the Reader may judge of the rest.

You tell me, p. 49. of your printed Reply, That I boldly cut *Abraham's Covenant*, Gen. 17. into two parts, and make the first to be a pure Covenant of Grace, which is the Promissory part, to the ninth Verse; and the Restipulation to be as pure a Covenant of Works. And, say you, what a hard shift will some Men make to maintain their Opinion. You further tell me, that I say truly, p. 50. that at the Seventh and Eighth Verses

was

was their Restipulation: Why then, say you, do you say, p. 224. that *vers.* the 7th he proceeds to speak of another Covenant than what he had been speaking of before? Does the Promise and the Restipulation make two Covenants, or are they just and necessary Parts of one and the same Covenant?

• Reply, Sir, I thought Conscience had more prevailed with you than so grossly to have prevaricated, as you have in this matter. I do indeed affirm. p. 223, 224. that Gen. 17. we have an account of a two fold Covenant which God there made with *Abraham*. The one with *Abraham* himself alone, not with his natural offspring, For (saith God, *vers.* 2) *I will make my Covenant between me and thee,* And *vers.* 4. *As for me Behold my Covenant is with thee. And thou shalt be called the Father of many Nations.* Or as the Apostle explains it, *Rom.* 4. 11. *The Father of all them that Believe,* which was *Abraham's* prerogative alone, and incommunicable to any else: So that this Covenant could have relation to no other, it being no way applicable to any other Person whatsoever, whether *Isaac* or *Jacob*, or any else of his natural offspring to be the Father of all them that Believe as *Abraham* was. The other which was the Covenant of Circumcision, was as plainly made between God and *Abraham* and his natural Seed also, as *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. declare. But do I therefore boldly cut the Covenant of Circumcision into two parts.

parts as you intimate I do, and make the first to be the pure Covenant of Grace, which is the Promissory Part to the 9th. *vers.* And the Restipulation to be as pure a Covenant of Works, Sir, I say no such thing. And I appeal unto all that shall read my Book, and examin those Passages you refer to, whether I am not altogether innocent in this matter. I tell you indeed in my p. 205. that Circumcision was appointed as a Sign or Token of the Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. and that both unto *Abraham* himself, and the rest that were under it.— it being no other than the Restipulation of the Covenant on their part, *Gen.* 17. 9, 10. But as there is no such thing to be found in my p. 205. to which you refer, nor any where else : So I do in my p. 224. as well as in many other pages, plainly tell you the quite contrary, that at the 7th. *vers.* was the Promissory part of that Covenant on God's part; the Restipulation on their part, as I there also plainly affirm being mentioned, *vers.* 9, 10. And whereas you tell me that I say truly, p. 205. that at the 7th. and 8th. *vers.* was their Restipulation, I must tell you that you are here mistaken in a double Respect. For first, can you indeed think that this was a true Speech, if I had said it, that at the 7th. and 8th. *vers.* was their Restipulation? Certainly this is not truly said, whoever said it. Secondly, I must also tell you, that I do neither there say so, nor any where

where else, nor should I have said *truly*, if I had so said: For the 7th. and 8th. vers. are wholly taken up with the Promises of that Covenant on God's part. And I do there on the contrary as plainly tell you as words could declare it, that the Restipulation of the Covenant on their part is expressed, vers. 9, 10. So that herein you do both wrong me and your self also.

The like Answer may be returned to what follows in your Discourse on this head, where you say that I also tell you that the Covenant Gen. 17. 1, 2, 3, 4. was a plain transcript of several free promises of the Gospel under the denomination of a Covenant. But, say you, "why then don't you take the Restipulation, vers. 7, 8, 9, 10. to be a part of it? Oh, no, there is something required on Abraham's and his Posterities part, they must be Circumcised, and that spoils all. But Sir, do you think you speak sense in this Passage? For can you imagine that the 7th. and 8th. vers. do contain any thing of Restipulation on their part? Are not these two verses wholly taken up with the promises on God's part? And do I not throughout my whole Discourse joyn the Restipulation on their part, vers. 9, 10. with the Promises on God's part, vers. 7, 8. as making up one, and the same Covenant of Circumcision. Thus you say, you care not what, or how, turning and twisting things as you please, so you may render your Opponent ridicu-

ridiculous, and laugh in your sleeve (among those that will swallow down any thing you deliver, without examination whether you say right or no. But Sir, though you may laugh at me at your pleasure, you must with all remember that God's truth will not be so mocked; but will certainly prevail, whatever devices of this nature Men may have to discredit the Assertors of it.

The like mistake are you guilty of; when you tell me that I do worse than contradict my self. *p. 133.* of my former discourse, in saying that the Law even as it is a Covenant of Works hath a Blessed Subserviency toward the establishment of the Promise. *10.* "For in as much said I, as it required perfect, sinless obedience under the Penalty of the Curse, it convinced Men that this was no way for sinners to seek for Life and Salvation by. And herewith it urged the consciences of Men, that they could have no Rest nor Peace in themselves; but what the Promise would afford them; whereunto therefore they saw a necessity of betaking themselves. But then, say you I unsay all again and worse than contradict my self, when I tell you afterward. *p. 173.* "That if we Preach up the Law as a Covenant of Life, or a Covenant of Faith and Grace, which are equipollent terms (as we distinguish as we please betwixt a Covenant of Grace absolutely and subordinately

*M. 3.
P. 7.*

such

“ such) and consequently are desirous in that
 “ respect to be under it; then according to the
 “ Apostles plain Scope in the whole Epistles
 “ to the *Romans* and *Galatians*, in stead of
 “ using it lawfully, we make an unlawful use
 “ thereof by perverting it to such a Service as
 “ God never intended it for.

Now I Appeal to the candid intelligent
 Reader whether there be any real Repugnancy
 or Contradiction betwixt those two Passages,
 as Mr. *Flavel* supposes there is? I do indeed
 acknowledge that the Law, even as it is a
 Covenant of Works, hath a blessed subserviency
 toward the establishment of the Promise, in the
 sense before expressed: when yet I deny that it
 is a Covenant of Life, or that the Scriptures do
 any where give it the title of a Subservient
 Covenant of Grace. For if it be a Covenant of
 Gospel Grace, as Mr. *Flavel* affirms it is, how
 is it Subservient thereunto as to another thing?
 To call it a Subservient Covenant, that is, nei-
 ther of Works, nor of Grace is wholly prepos-
 terous, and alien to the Scriptures. Either
 therefore it must be a Covenant of Works, or
 a Covenant of Grace; there being no medium
 betwixt these two. If it be a Covenant of
 Grace, then it cannot be a Subservient Cove-
 nant thereunto, for it is the thing it self, which
 in this respect it is pretended to be Subser-
 vient unto. If it be a Covenant of Works, then
 you grant my main Position. And indeed in no
 other respect

pect can it be Subservient unto the Gospel Covenant, but as it is a Covenant of Works: For so it convinceth Men of their Sin and Misery without Christ, and their Necessity therefore of a Saviour. It shews Men as in a glass, the Purity and Holiness of God's nature, together with their own defilement, and impurity; where by it effectually promotes the Design of the Gospel Covenant: For in as much as it requires Perfect, sinless obedience under the Penalty of the Curse, it convinceth Men that this is no way for Sinners to seek for Life and Salvation by, and consequently forceth them to Christ their onely Remedy.

Mr. Flavel therefore doth greatly mistake his measures, and widely misses the mark he aims at, when he thinks to find a contradiction betwixt these two forementioned Passages, which are in themselves so perfectly harmonious, and so agreeable withal to the whole scope of the Scriptures.

And as greatly is he mistaken, when he tells me as he doth in the following part of his Discourse, that the Law was added as an Appendix to the Covenant of Grace, or Gospel Promise from what the Apostle speaks, Gal. 3, 19. *That the Law was added because of transgressions till the Seed should come to whom the Promise was made.* When the Apostle had told us just before, *That if the Inheritance be of the Law it is no more of Promise: But*
M. S. p. 8,
Printed Reply.
p. 25.
God

God gave it to Abraham by Promise. And if
 so, How was the Law added as an Appendix
 to the Promise? Why might it not be added
 as an Appendix rather, to the First Covenant
 of Works, to re-inforce that (it being as
 your self confess materially considered of the
 same stamp), the more effectually thereby to
 convince Men of their need of a Saviour? It is
 wholly Preposterous therefore to affirm that
 the Law was of the same Peice & Complexion
 with the Promise; or that God did publish it,
 as you say he did, with Evangelical Purposes,
 as if it were of the same nature with the Pro-
 mise. The Promise (saith the Apostle) gi-
 veth Life. For Abraham's inheritance was by
 that very means derived unto him. But the
 Law could not give Life. Abraham's Inheri-
 tance was not derived unto him through the
 Law, but the Promise, *vers. 18, 21.* And how
 was the Law then of the same Nature with
 the Promise? Wherefore then *saith he* the Law?
It was added because of transgressions; that is,
 either to restrain Sin, and set some Bounds
 thereunto, *1. Tim. vi. 9.* Or to shew and dis-
 cover Sin, *Rom. 7. 13.* But then it follows
 not that it had any affinity with the Promise.
 For if it had, it would have given Life as the
 Promise did; But this it could not do, there-
 fore it was essentially different from the Pro-
 mise. For (saith he) *vers. 21.* If there had
 been a Law given which could have given Life,
 verily Righteousness should have been by the Law;
 But

But the Scripture hath concluded all under Sin that
the Promise by Faith of Jesus Christ might be given
to them that Believe.

But then there is another
grand Absurdity which Mr. ^{M. S. P. 6.} ^{Printed Reply.} ^{P. 21.} Flaxell will needs Endeavor if
he can to fasten upon me, and
that is for speaking as I do, B. 134. of my
former Discourse; "That according to the
plain and clear scope of the Apostles Rea-
soning in the forementioned Gal. 3. the
Law is so far from being a Covenant of
Faith, that it is quite another thing: For
if it had been a Covenant of Faith, it
would have given Life as the Covenant of
Faith doth. But it could not give Life,
therefore it could be no other than a Cove-
nant of Works. But is the Law then a-
gainst the Promises? God forbid, (saith
Paul,) and so say we: For supposing the
Law to be, as it is indeed, a Pure Covenant
of Works; yet through the satisfaction of
Christ, there is no Repugnancy betwixt
the Law and the Promises; or between the
Law and Faith, which hath Respect to the
Promises. There is only a Difference of
Deficiency in respect of that strength that
there is in the one, to what there was in
the other; the one being weak through
the flesh, the other strong and powerful:
But what the Law could not do through
our Weakness, that Christ hath performed,
" by

“ by fulfilling its Commands, and submit-
 “ ting to its Curse on our behalf, whereby
 “ God’s Justice is satisfied, and Everlasting
 “ Righteousness obtained for the Relief of
 “ Sinners, &c.

Now what of Absurdity, or Self-Contradiction, can any Ingenuous, or Impartial, Reader find in this Passage? Yes, saith Mr. *Flavell*, because you here say, there is only a *Difference of Deficiency* betwixt the Law and the Gospel, the one being strong and powerful, the other weak and unable to Relieve us. When yet you elsewhere Affirm, that there is a *Specifical Difference* between them.

Reply. Sir, It should seem by this, that you have a mighty Itch to find out some Absurdity, or some Contradiction or other, in my Discourse, which Argues no over-friendly Humour, whatever you may pretend. But suppose there be no real Contradiction betwixt these two Passages, but in your Imagination only, from an over sollicitous desire to make it appear to be such, if you cannot find it such? And that it is so, I beseech you once more to consider, that when I Affirm that there is a *Specifical Difference* betwixt the Law and the Gospel, I am there speaking of the *terms of Life* contained in either: For in this respect they are *Specifically Different*. The one saith, *Do this and Live.* The other, *Believe and thou shalt be saved.* In the former Passage I am not speaking of the *terms* of either

ther Covenant, or the true and proper Nature of either in that respect; but only concerning the *seeming Repugnancy* that there is between them, from the forementioned Objection. *Is the Law then against the Promises?* And what is the ground of this Objection? The Apostle had said before, that *if the Inheritance be of the Law, it is no more of Promise; but God gave it to Abraham by Promise.* *Is the Law then against the Promise?* God forbid. For, saith he, *if there had been a Law which could have given Life, verily Righteousness should have been by the Law.* So then, the Law would but could not give Life; and why could it not give Life, but through our Weakness, we were not able to perform it, nor could the Law furnish us with power to Enable us thereunto. But *what the Law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh*, that Christ hath performed, and by his Death and Sufferings made up the Breach between God and us. And so in this respect there is only a *Difference of Deficiency* between the Law and the Gospel; the one being strong and powerful, the other weak and unable to Relieve us. But yet, say I, this Difference notwithstanding, through the satisfaction of Christ there is no Repugnancy, or Hostile Contrariety betwixt the Law and the Promises; or between the Law and Faith which hath respect to the Promises, &c.

M. S. P. 7.
Printed Reply.
 P. 22.

This you account strange Doctrin, " The Reason you give, say you, is as strange, that " this comes to pass through " the satisfaction of Christ. Good Sir, say " you, Enlighten us in this Rare Notion. " Did Christ Die to purchase a Reconciliati- " on betwixt the Covenant of Works, as " such, and the Covenant of Grace ? And I pray Sir, why not ? Did not Christ satisfie the Law on our behalf ? Was he not made of a Woman, made under the Law, to Redeem them that were under the Law, that we might receive the Adoption of Sons ? Doth or can the Law it self Impeach those for whom Christ Died, and whom God himself pronounceth Righteous ? Doth not the Law it self that was before our Enemy, against us, and contrary to us, stand up as our Friend, through the Mediation of Christ ? And hath not God for this very purpose, set forth his Son Christ unto us a Propitiation, through Faith in his Blood, to declare unto us his Righteousness, that he might be Just, and the Justifier of him that Believeth in Jesus ? And were not the Two Tables accordingly put into the Ark, to shew their subserviency to Christ, and in this sense, its Consistency with him, Typically demonstrating, that though the Covenant of Works could not be kept or performed by us ; yet it should be perfectly fulfilled in Christ for us ? Is there not

not here a Perfect Reconciliation betwixt the Two Covenants? Are not Mercy and Truth here met together? And do not Righteousness and Peace sweetly Kiss and Embrace each other, through the satisfaction of Christ?

And yet it follows not, that to be Justified by Works and by Faith, should after Christ's Death make no odds of Difference between them; according to the Corrupt Inference which you unjustly draw from the Premises: For though 'tis true, in a sense we may be said to be Justified by Works rightly and truly enough; that is, as Christ in his own Person hath fulfilled the Law for us; yet your Inference is far enough from being truly deducible from the Premises according to the common and proper sense of Justification by Works: Since as all our own Works are throughout the Scripture perfectly Excluded from any concern in that matter, (*viz.*) as the meritorious or procuring cause of our Justification. So they are according to the tenour of the foregoing Discourse also: For if Christ hath satisfied the Law for us, hence it follows that our Justification is only the fruit of Gods meer free Grace alone, through the Redemption that is in Christ Jesus.

Thus much may suffice to have been spoken concerning the Absurdities, or Self-contradictions, which Mr. *Flavell* chargeth on me: Which so far as they have been al-

ready Examined, the Reader may easily perceive that they do all of them return upon himself. There is only one Passage more which doth more nearly touch the Heart of the Controversie betwixt us, which is necessary also to be considered before we proceed unto what follows. And that is this,

Whereas I have Affirmed, and do still Affirm, that there was no Promise of Pardon on Repentance in *Moses's* Covenant: Mr. *Flavell* thinks he hath a mighty Advantage against me, and supposes I do therein plainly contradict my self, because I do yet grant, that God promiseth Pardon on Repentance, *Lev. 26.* which Mr. *Flavell* Affirms, to belong to the Dispensation of the Law at Mount *Sinai*, where the *Jews* are directed to the Covenant which God had made with *Jacob*, *Isaac*, and *Abraham*, for their Relief in this respect? For that is the Covenant, saith God there, that I will remember. “ Well, Be it
 “ so, (saith Mr. *Flavell*,) if you will needs
 “ have it so, that the Promise mentioned,
 “ *Lev. 26.* refers to *Abraham's* Covenant;
 “ yet still it follows, that the Covenant made
 “ with *Abraham* must be a Conditional Co-
 “ venant of Grace: For so its made by this
 “ very Text, *If they accept the Punishment of*
 “ *their Iniquities, and their Uncircumcised Hearts*
 “ *be humbled, then will I remember my Covenant*
 “ *with Abraham, &c.* You see then that
 “ no Unhumbled or Impenitent Person could
 “ have

“ have Relief from it, till Confession and
 “ Contrition were wrought in him ; when
 “ you in the mean time stoutly deny, that
 “ there are any Conditions required in a Gos-
 “ pel Covenant. *M. S. P. 5. Printed Re-
 “ ply. P. 20.*

But then Mr. *Flavell* should have considered that this Contrition and Gospel Humiliation, can by no means be Effected or Expres-
 sed till the Heart be first soundly wrought up-
 on by the Grace of that Covenant which God
 hath made with Sinners in Jesus Christ. And
 accordingly this is one main Branch of that
 Covenant, *Deut. 30. 6.* which I have already
 proved to be a Gospel Covenant, and Es-
 sentially Different from that of the Law. *The
 Lord thy God will Circumcise thy Heart, and the
 Heart of thy Seed, to Love the Lord thy God with
 all thy Heart, and with all thy Soul, that thou
 mayst Live.* Compare this with the foremen-
 tioned Text in *Leviticus, If their Uncircumcised
 Hearts be humbled, &c.* The Sinner might
 Reply, But Lord, this we cannot do of our
 selves, we cannot break our hard and flinty
 Hearts, nor will it ever be performed until
 thou takest the Work into thine own Hand.
 This therefore the Lord himself undertakes.
The Lord thy God will Circumcise thy Heart, &c.
 And what Condition can there be of that,
 but that of the good Pleasure of God's own
 Goodness and Grace ? For whatever is Ante-
 cedent thereunto, being only a Work or Act

of Corrupted Nature, can be no Condition whereon the Dispensation of Spiritual Grace is superadded. From whence, as I have already told you, it plainly follows, that the Covenant of Grace is wholly Free and Absolute: For as much as there is nothing that can be supposed as the Condition thereof, whether it be Faith, Repentance, or new Obedience, which is not therein Absolutely Promised.

Thus God himself is pleased to Represent unto us the Nature of that New and Evangelical Covenant which he Promised to make with the House of Israel and Judah, after those Days; Not, saith he, according to the Covenant which I made with their Fathers at Sinai, (which was a Conditional Covenant,) For I will put my Laws into their Minds, and Write them in their Hearts; that is, I will make such a Covenant with them as shall be wholly Free and Absolute: Wherein as I do faithfully Engage, that I will not Depart from them; so neither shall they Depart from me. For let Men talk what they will of an Universal Conditional Covenant of Grace: If there be any such thing, I am sure it is not that here intended: For as there are no Conditions expressed, whether in *Jeremy*, or in *Ezekiel*, or in the Apostle's Repetition thereof, *Hebrews* the Eighth; so they are all Actually Pardoned with whom this Covenant is made: For this is all the Reason which

which God himself alledges, why he would become their God, and make them his People, give them the knowledg of himself, a New Heart, and a New Spirit: For, saith he, *I will be Merciful to their Unrighteousness, and their Sins and Iniquities will I remember no more.* Thus the New Covenant is a Promise of Pardon and Grace, and of all those things which are contended to be the Conditions of it. Nor 'is there any Condition implied which may alter the the nature of an Absolute Promise: For in *Jer. 31.* whence the Form of this Covenant is taken, all *Objections* are prevented, *Verse 36.* For whereas it might have been said, They for their Sins should be destroyed, and so this Promise should not profit them, it is added, That they should be Restored, and so the Promise is made good, as sure as the Ordinances of Heaven, the Course of Day and Night, or the Tides of the Sea; which I am sure depend upon no Conditions to be Performed by Men.

When God tells them in *Leviticus* therefore, *If they Accept the Punishment of their Iniquities, and their Uncircumcised Hearts be humbled, &c.* It must of necessity be thus understood. For if God should require this to be performed by us, as an *Antecedent Condition* on our Parts, without which we may expect no Mercy, or Favour, at his Hands, we are like Eternally to fall short thereof: It being

as impossible for us to Humble our selves, or to change the Temper of our own Hearts, as for the *Ethiopian* to change his Skin, or the Leopard his Spots: Yea, as for a Dead Man to Raise himself to Life. And if none of these things can be done of our selves, but they must be wrought in us by the Grace of the Covenant; then how doth it appear that the New Covenant is a Conditional Covenant; or that Faith and Repentance are required of us in point of Duty, Antecedently to the Benefit of the Promise? *I know O Lord, saith Jeremy, that the Way of Man is not in himself. It is not in Man that walketh to direct his steps. So Ephraim, Turn thou me, and I shall be turned. And then, saith God, shalt thou remember and be Ashamed, and Confounded, and never open thy Mouth any more, because of thy Shame, when thou shalt know that I am Pacified toward thee for all that thou hast done, Ezek. 16. 60, 61. &c.* So that God always prevents the Sinner with the Blessings of his Goodness; and instead of expecting any Antecedent Conditions, or Qualifications, that should render us meet for his Grace; 'tis the Sovereign Fruit and Effect of his Free Grace alone, which he hath expressed in his Holy Covenant, that can make us Meet for himself, or any Mercy he hath to bestow upon us.

I must tell you therefore, Sir, that you do exceedingly injure, and wrong, the Free Grace

Grace of God to Sinners in Jesus Christ, when you tell me as you do in your following Discourse ; *That there is something as an Act required of us in point of Duty, which is Antecedent to the Benefit of the Promise.* If you mean, that those things, whether it be Faith, Repentance, or Gospel Humiliation, though Absolutely Promised in the Covenant, and wrought in us by the Grace of God ; are yet Duties indispensibly required of us, in order unto the Participation, or Enjoyment, of the full end of the Covenant in Glory ; it is unquestionably true : But if you intend that they are such a Condition of the Covenant, as to be by us Performed Antecedently unto the Participation of any Grace, Mercy, or Benefit, of it, as your Words imply ; it is most untrue, and not only contrary to Express Testimony of Scripture, but Destructive of the Nature of the Covenant it self : For if so, Men must do all these things, before they receive the Remission of Sins. Yes, then must Men Repent and Believe, and Turn to God, and yield Obedience to the Gospel, whilst they are as yet *Dead in Trespases, and in Sins* : Yes, then must they do them, whilst they are under the Law and the Curse of it : For so are All Men whose Sins are not Pardoned. But this is to make Obedience unto the Law, and that to be performed by Men whilst under the Curse of it,

Printed Reply. P. 61.

to be a Condition of Gospel Mercy ; which is to overthrow both the Law and the Gospel.

You will tell me, it may be, that on the other hand it will follow, that Men are Pardoned before they do Believe. But then you ought to consider. First, That the Communion and Donation of Faith unto us, is an Effect of the same Grace whereby our Sins are Pardoned, and they are both bestowed on us by vertue of the same Covenant. Secondly, That though the Application of Pardoning Mercy unto our Souls, is in order of Nature consequent unto Believing, yet in time they go together. Thirdly, That Faith is not required as a *Condition*, in order to the *Procuring* of the Pardon of our Sins ; but only as a *Necessary Means* in order to the *Receiving* of it. A Condition, as a procuring cause, plainly implies something of Merit, by way of Condignity, or Congruity, whether it be more or less, perfect or imperfect, call it what you will : But Faith comes under neither of these Notions, being only a *Necessary Means*, or as an Instrument (which also must be wrought in us by the Grace of the Covenant,) whereby we Receive and Apply, but cannot Procure, the Mercy Promised.

In the next place then, avoiding any further Discourses concerning the Pretended Absurdities and Self-contradictions, which upon

on a diligent search Mr. *Flavell* supposes he hath found out in my forementioned Discourse, which upon a due trial may be easily perceived to have been the bare Fiction of his own Imagination only : I shall immediately Apply my self to what is more Substantial, and will certainly tend far more to the Edification of the Intelligent Reader, if any Light may be hereby struck out for his illumination and Instruction, concerning the Three Grand Points we are now contending about. And that is,

First, Whether the *Sinai* Covenant was a Covenant of Works, or a Covenant of Faith ?

Secondly, Whether the Covenant of Circumcision was not of the same Nature ?

Thirdly, Whether the Gospel Covenant is wholly Free and Absolute, or Conditional ?

S E C T.

S E C T. I I.

IN the first place then ; As to what concerns the *Sinai* Covenant , there are two things before us, and that is ; First, to prove that it could be no other than a Covenant of Works, and that as contradiſtinct or eſſentially different from the Promise of Grace, or the Gospel Covenant. Secondly, that it is the very ſame for ſubſtance, or for the eſſence of it, with *Adam's* Covenant.

For the firſt, I think I have already in my former Diſcourſe, ſubſtantially proved that the *Sinai* Covenant could be no other than a Covenant of Works, and that as it is contradiſtinguiſhed, or oppoſed unto the Covenant of Faith, or the Gospel Covenant, and eſſentially different therefrom. And this I have done by 23. Scripture Arguments founded upon plain Scripture Teſtimonies ; which one would think ſhould be fully Convictive to all that pretend to any reverence for Scripture authority.

Mr. *Flavell*, indeed, tells me in his Printed Reply, p. 54. that all my 23 Arguments fall to the Ground at one ſtroke : My *Medius Terminus* having one Senſe in my Major Propoſition,

position, and another in my Minor; and so every Argument hath four Terms in it; as will easily (saith he) be evinced by the particular consideration of the respective places from whence they are drawn. But why had not Mr. *Flavell* evinced this, and so knockt them down, as he saith, at one Blow? He onely threatens but doth not perform. This is indeed, an easie way of Answering Arguments, if the bare affirmation that they are not rightly formed, must be taken for a sufficient confutation.

As for the second, that the *Sinai* Covenant was the same for substance with that made with *Adam*, I have already also in my former Discourse Answered Mr. *Flavell's* four Arguments pretending to prove that the *Sinai* Covenant, and that made with *Adam* in Paradise, were not the same, but widely different Covenants. Unto which he hath not as yet thought fit to give me any Reply to Enervate the force of my contrary Reasons; but onely by Cavilling at some pretended Absurdity he thinks he hath found out in my 179 pag. &c. Which hath been already cleared.

All that Remains therefore now to be done, is to subjoyn some Select Scripture Arguments plainly proving the contrary to what he hath Asserted. viz. That the *Sinai* Covenant, and that made with *Adam*, are for substance the same. My first Argument then runs thus,

Argum.

Argum. 1. That Covenant that is not of Faith, must needs be a Covenant of Works; yea the very same for Substance with that made with *Adam*: But the Scripture is express that the Law is not of Faith. *Ergo. &c.*

For the confirmation hereof, I shall lay down these four Propositions. First, that it is evident there can be no Medium betwixt these two, Faith and Works. Secondly, That neither will they admit of any Mixture. Thirdly, That the Law is not of Faith. Fourthly, That if the Law is not of Faith, it must needs be a Covenant of Works; yea the same for Substance with that made with *Adam*.

My first Proposition is; That it is evident there can be no Medium betwixt these two, Faith and Works. If there is, let it be shewn what it is and wherein it doth consist. And therefore to talk of a Subservient Covenant distinct from these two, is a vain thing; It must be one of them: Either it must be a Covenant of Faith, or it must be a Covenant of Works. There can be no Medium betwixt them.

Secondly, 'Tis as evident that neither will they admit of any Mixture. If the Law is of Faith, it cannot be of Works. And so on the contrary; If it be of Works, it cannot be of Faith. If this be questioned, the Apostle will soon Resolve it. *Rom. 4, 16. Therefore it is of Faith* (speaking of the Gospel Covenant)

natur) *That it might be by Grace.* And Rom. 11. 6. *If by Grace, then is it no more of Works, otherwise Grace is no more Grace. And if it be of Works, then it is no more Grace, otherwise Work is no more Work.*

Thirdly, 'Tis as evident, that the Law is not of Faith. This the Apostle affirmeth in expresse Terms, Gal. 3. 12. You will tell me perhaps that the Law is not of Faith *Comparatively* in respect of that clear discovery thereof which the Gospel now give us; Not *Absolutely* as if it were not of Faith at all. But what plain Scripture Testimony may not be after this sort Evaded and Eluded? May what truths of the Gospel can we be sure of, if this Course be allowed? Doth not the Apostle expressly, designedly, industriously affirm and prove it, that *the Law is not of Faith*? but on the contrary that *the Man that doth these things shall live by them*? Doth he not bring an expresse Testimony from the mouth of the Law giver himself, that *as many as are of the Works of the Law are under the Curse*, &c. vers. 10. And doth he not also tell us that *'Tis evident that no Man is justified by the Law in the sight of God*? vers. 11. And doth he not assume from all this, that *the Law is not of Faith, but the Man that doth them shall live in them*. vers. 12. And shall we presume to affirm notwithstanding that the Law is of Faith, yea a Covenant of Faith in Christ Jesus?

It may be you will yet tell me as Mr. Robert's doth that in this *Sinai* Covenant, those opposite conditions of perfect doing under pain of Curse and Death, and of Believing in Christ, are very differently required and revealed. Believing in Christ is revealed very sparingly and obscurely. Perfect doing very frequently and plainly. But, saith he, tho' those two conditions of perfect doing and believing be thus differently revealed and required in the *Sinai* Covenant; yet Believing in Christ unto Life and Righteousness, was therein chiefly and ultimately intended; And perfect doing onely urged in Subordination and tendency to Believing.

But then (say I) If believing in Christ unto Life and Righteousness, was chiefly and ultimately intended in the *Sinai* Covenant, and perfect doing onely urged in Subordination and tendency to Believing. How comes it to pass that the Apostle doth so directly oppose the Righteousness of Faith, to the Righteousness of that Covenant? *Rom. 10. 5, 6.* *Moses*, saith he, *describeth the Righteousness of the Law that the Man that doth these things shall live by them. But the Righteousness which is of Faith speaketh on this Wise, &c.* In a quite different strain; wherein, when he tells us that the Law saith, *Do this and live.* How can it be understood but that his meaning is, that this is the onely Righteousness which the Law requireth in order to Life and Salvation;

Or

or this is that which it ultimately intends; and that it propounds no other way in order thereunto? For otherwise we cannot rationally understand him, especially, since he doth else where assure us, that *the Law is not of Faith*. And accordingly, whatever Subordination or Tendency the Law hath to drive us to the Covenant of Faith, for Relief and Shelter; to be sure the Law it self gives us no Relief: For neither chiefly nor ultimately doth it propound Faith as the condition of Life, but doing only; and consequently, is another Covenant, and Essentially different from the Covenant of Faith, to which it drives us. The Law, saith *Moses*, requireth doing unto Life. The Gospel, saith *Paul*, requireth Faith. *And these*, saith he, Gal. 4. 24, 25, 26. *are the two Covenants, the one from Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem that now is; the other, to Jerusalem that is above; the one gendereth to Bondage, the other to Liberty; the one a ministration of Death and Condemnation, the other a ministration of Life and Righteousness*: 2 Cor. 3. 7, 8, 9. Now whom shall we believe, *Paul* or you? Whether shall we believe the Blessed Apostle, who affirms, that the Law is not of Faith, but of Works; and that these are the two Covenants; and who in effect also affirms, that these two Covenants are essentially, or specifically different in respect of the terms of Life propounded in either; or those that affirm,

firm, that the Law is of Faith; yea, that it is a Covenant of Faith in Christ Jesus?

These things being thus premised; my fourth Proposition, roundly and naturally follows: For first, If it is evident that there can be no medium betwixt these two, Faith and Works. And if it is as evident, that neither will they admit of any mixture. And if it be also as evident, that the Law is not of Faith, since neither chiefly nor ultimately was it propounded or intended thereby; then, it will unavoidably follow, that the *Sinai* Covenant is a Covenant of Works: Yea, the very same for substance with that made with *Adam*. It cannot be supposed, that *Adam's* Covenant was a Covenant of Faith; and I have now plainly proved, that the *Sinai* Covenant was not; the down right consequence of which is, that they were both of the same stamp for the substance of them.

Argum. 2. That Covenant which saith, *Do this and Live*, or requireth perfect sinless Obedience, in order to the obtainment of Life and Happiness, and pronounceth a Curse upon the least failing, must needs be a Covenant of Works, the same for substance, and of the very self same stamp with *Adam's* Covenant. But such is the nature of the *Sinai* Covenant. *Ergo.*

The minor onely needing Proof, hath it abundantly, from *Rom. 10. 5.* *Moses*, saith the Apostle, *Describeth the Righteousness which*

is of the Law, that the man which doth these things shall live by them: which he citeth from Lev. 18. 5. *Ye shall therefore keep my Statutes and Judgments, which if a man do, he shall live in them.* And what can be a more plain Description of a Covenant of Works; and that not in the way of a Partial Imperfect Obedience: But as it is written, *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the Book of the Law, to do them: Gal. 3. 10.* which the Apostle quotes from *Deut. 27. 26.* *Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this Law, to do them. And all the People shall say, Amen.*

And therefore, when it evidently appears, that this was the nature of the Sinai Covenant, in the very first Sanction of it, as the fruit of God's special Designation and Appointment: and when it is also as manifest, that from hence it is, that the Apostle calls it as he doth, *A ministration of Death and Condemnation*; and therefore now took out of the way, being nailed to the Cross of Christ: It is the greatest Violation and Perverting of Scripture that can lightly be met with, to affirm, that all this is uttered and declared by Paul, yea, by Moses and God himself, onely because the Jews had perverted it, and not as God intended it: For how could the Jews have perverted it before it was Instituted? Is there any Scripture that gives the least ground for such a Supposition? May we not make any thing or nothing

thing of the Scripture, after this rate of Reasoning? Would not the Apostle, 2 Cor. 3. and Col. 3. have given some hint or other, that this had been the meaning, when he thunders against the Law, as there he doth; that he meant it was so and so, onely as the Ignorance and Infidelity of unregenerate Men had made it to themselves, and not as God intended it? And so when he tells us, Gal. 3. That the Law requires Perfect Obedience under the pain of a Curse; would he not have giuen some hint or other, that this was onely because the *Jews* had perverted it, and that it was not so in it self? But can we think that Men of Reason will be so easily baffled? Or can we believe, that Men that have any regard to the Judgment of another day, will be content to have their Eyes blinded, so as to receive such Doctrines as these? The Apostle was careful *not to handle the word of God deceitfully, but by manifestation of the Truth, commending our selves, saith he, to every man's Conscience in the sight of God; 2 Cor. 4. 2.* So again, *We are not as many which corrupt the word of God, but as of Sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God, so speak we in Christ; 2 Cor. 2. 17.* It would have been well if this Rule had been duly observed in our present case. The want of this hath been often charged on those that plead for the right of Believers onely to Baptism. I shall only pray, that neither we, nor those that oppose us herein, may be found guilty

guilty of such a Transgression in the Great Day.

I shall add, for the proof of the minor Proposition of the forementioned Argument, what you your self have asserted, p. 326, of your Book, entituled, *The Method of Grace. The Law*, (say you there) *requires perfect working under the pain of a Curse. Accepted of no short endeavours, admitted no Repentance, gave no strength.*

And if any Man can give a fuller Testimony concerning the Law, as a Covenant of Works, let him if he can. I have alledged this to you in order to your Conviction upon this account; and your Answer is,

“ That this was as the Ignorance and Infidelity of Unregenerate Men had made it to themselves, and not as God intended it: So, say you, it was a Covenant of Works, a ministration of Death and Condemnation. And so, say you, it requires perfect working under pain of a Curse; accepts no short endeavours, admitted no Repentance, and gave no strength. But, Sir, can you, indeed, upon second thoughts, think this to be a fit or proper Answer? Is this by manifestation of the Truth, to commend your self to every Man’s Conscience in the sight of God? Do you indeed think this to be a good and sound Scripture Distinction, to save you from the guilt of Self-contradiction, when you deny the Law

*Printed Reply,
p. 134, 135.
Together with
your Letter to
me on the same
Subject.*

Law to be a Covenant of Works in one Book, and yet, affirm all this concerning it in another? Can you justly and truly say, That the Law was not such in its first Institution, as you there affirm concerning it? Was the Law capable of being altered or changed in respect of its true and proper Nature and Institution, by the Ignorance and Infidelity of Men? Did not God himself, in the first Promulgation of it, pronounce a Curse upon the least transgression thereof? You have told me with a great deal of Confidence, That God promiseth Pardon on Repentance in the *Sinai* Covenant; and yet you say in your forementioned Book, That the Law admitted no Repentance. Well, how will you reconcile these two passages? Why thus you have attempted the reconciling of them: That as the Ignorance and Infidelity of Unregenerate Men had made it to themselves, so it admitted of no Repentance, otherwise it did. But, Sir, you know what the Apostle tells us, *Rom. 3. 3. What if some did not believe, shall their unbelief make the Faith of God without effect?* So I may as justly say in our present Case; What if some did not believe; shall their Unbelief alter the true Nature and Property of the Law, in respect of what it was in its Primitive Institution? If it was a Covenant of Grace, or a Life-giving Covenant; a Covenant wherein God promised Pardon of Sin on Repentance, as you affirm he did; why

why then sure it is so still, the ignorance or infidelity of Men cannot alter the Nature or property of God's Covenant; especially so as to make it essentially different from what it was in its self. The Lord deliver me from such Doctrins or Practices, that naturally involve Men in such gross Absurdities.

But for your further conviction herein, I desire you to cast your Eye upon what those worthy and learned Divines, your Brethren, that have set forth the second Volumn of Mr. *Pool's* Annotations upon the Bible, who I know are Men of unquestionable credit and authority with you, and those of your own Way; I say I desire you to cast your Eye on what is affirmed by them, upon 2. *Cor.* 3. 6, 7. in confirmation of the Minor Proposition of my forementioned Argument. Upon the 6th. *vers.* their Note runs thus. "By the Letter here, the Apostle understandeth the Law. And the Law in opposition to the Gospel is called the Letter, because it was onely a Revelation of the will of God concerning Man's Duty : No Revelation of God's Grace, either in pardoning Men their omissions of Duty, and doing Acts contrary to Duty, or assisting Men to the performance of their Duty : For the Letter of the Law killeth, The Law, sheweth Men their Duty, Accuseth, Condemneth and Denounceth the wrath of God against Men for not doing their Duty, but
" gives

“ gives no strength for the doing of it : But the Gospel giveth life, &c. Where you may observe that your Brethren come up fully to your own Notions about the Law expressed in your forementioned Book. But do they give the same Reasons for all this as you do, that this was onely because the *Jews* had Perverted it, or as the Ignorance and Infidelity of unregenerate Men had made it to themselves? No, for that would have been the way to have overthrown all they had said before, and to have contradicted themselves, as well as the truth of God, which lay so plainly before them, in the Scripture they were now opening. Nor do you your self give the least hint to this purpose in your forementioned Book; For it would never have gone down with any shadow of truth, or with any kind of coherence in Respect of the foregoing and following Passages you are there insisting on.

But I must yet further confront you with the testimony of your worthy Bretheren before mentioned, in their Annotations upon *vers. 7. of the forementioned, 2. Cor. 3. For if the ministration of Death written and ingraven in stones was glorious, &c.* “ In the former “ verse, say they, He had called the Law the “ Letter; And the Gospel in opposition to it “ he had called the Spirit. Here he calleth “ the ministration of the Law, the ministration of Death, because it onely shewed Man “ his

" his Duty, or things to be done, but gave
 " no strength or help, by which he should do
 " them. Onely cursing Man, but shewing
 " him no way how he should escape that
 " curse. So it did kill Men, and lead them
 " to Eternal Death and Condemnation, with-
 " out shewing them any means of Life and
 " Salvation. And if any Man can speak more
 full at home to the Point in the Description
 of the Law, as a pure Covenant of Works,
 let him do it if he can; For my part I cannot.
 And if according to this their Description
 and character by them here given of the Law,
 as to the true and real nature of it, there is
 yet in your opinion any Room left for such
 an Evasion as that of yours before mentioned
 is; That thus it was onely as the ignorance
 and infidelity of unregenerate Men had made
 it to themselves: I may justly say of such as
 are so minded, as hath been often said upon
 like occasions. *Qui vult decipi, decipiatur.* He
 that will be deceived let him be deceived. I
 have endeavoured you see with all my might
 to undeceive you: If you will not, the fault
 shall be yours and not mine.

But I must remember that I have not onely
 to prove in the general that the Law is a Co-
 venant of Works; but that it is the same for
 substance with *Adam's* Covenant. Now you
 your self would formerly allow me whatever
 you will do now, that the *Sinai* Covenant
 was the same with *Adam's* Covenant mate-
 D rially

rially considered, but that intentionally it was vastly different; And gave your Reasons; Those Reasons I have Answered in my former Discourse, where I have already proved that it was the same with *Adam's* Covenant in both Respects, that is intentionally, as well

as materially considered : For
Sol. Call. pag. as much as God never designed
 164, 165, that *Adam* himself should attain

unto life and righteousness by his obedience to that Covenant, no more than he did that the *Jews* should in respect of the *Sinai* Covenant. The Argument is there plainly stated and needs not here to be repeated. Nor have you returned me any the least Reply thereunto; Nor indeed unto my Answers to the rest of your Arguments upon that Head; where this very Point, that the Law was the same for Substance with *Adam's* Covenant, is sufficiently discussed as hath been before noted.

Upon the whole I shall now last of all Appeal unto the late worthy Dr. *Owen*, that famous and Blessed Servant of Christ in his Generation, who being dead his Works yet speak for him, and will preserve him a Blessed Savour among all that truly fear God. I say I shall now last of all Appeal unto him, whom I know you, and those of your way have a just Respect and Veneration for; whether the *Sinai* Covenant was the same for substance with *Adam's* Covenant, or not?

Now

Now this Question he hath plainly resolved, in that late excellent and judicious Discourse of his; Entituled; *The Doctrin of Justification by Imputed Righteousness*. p. 397. His words are these.

“ The whole entire nature of the Covenant
 “ of Works, consisted in this, that upon our
 “ Personal obedience unto the Law and the
 “ Rule of it, we should be accepted with God,
 “ and rewarded by him. Herein the Essence
 “ of it did consist. And whatever Covenant
 “ proceeds on these terms, or hath the nature
 “ of them in it, however it may be varied
 “ with Additions or Alterations, is the same
 “ Covenant still and not another : As in the
 “ Renovation of the Promise wherein the
 “ Essence of the Covenant of Grace was con-
 “ tained, God did oftimes make other Addi-
 “ tions unto it, unto *Abraham* and *David*; yet
 “ was it still the same Covenant for the Sub-
 “ stance of it, and not another so whatever
 “ variations may be made in, or Additions
 “ unto the Dispensation of the first Covenant;
 “ So long as this Rule is retained, *Do this*
 “ *and live*, It is still the same Covenant for
 “ the Substance and Essence of it.

I can add no more after so worthy a Sentence from so worthy a Person, backt with so much Reason, and Scripture Authority, for the confirmation of the present Point. And whether this was not the nature of the *Sinai* Covenant, as the Dr. hath now stated

it, let all Men who have perused the Scriptures Judg.

My Third Argument is this,

Argum. 3. That Covenant that Admitted not of Faith in the Redeemer, nor Repentance of Sin; since Pardon of Sin and Curse for Sin are Inconsistent, could not be a Covenant of Faith, but must of necessity be a Covenant of Works: Yea, the very same for substance, and of the same stamp with that made with *Adam* himself: But the Scripture doth assure us, that such was the Nature of the *Sinai* Covenant. *Ergo,*

That the *Sinai* Covenant Admitted not of Faith in the Redeemer, is Evident, since it Admitted not of Repentance of Sin. It will be easily granted, that the Doctrin of Christ was a Doctrin of Repentance. This was the Doctrin of his Harbinger *John* the Baptist, *Matth. 3. 2. Repent ye, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.* So *Mark 1. 4. He came Preaching the Baptism of Repentance for the Remission of Sins.* And accordingly we are told concerning the Redeemer himself, that *God hath Exalted him with his own Right-hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give Repentance to Israel, and the Forgiveness of Sins, Acts 5. 31.* Now that the *Sinai* Covenant Admitted not Repentance of Sin, is as Evident; since Pardon of Sin and Curse for Sin are Inconsistent: For the Scripture doth Expressly assure us, that *as many as are of the Works*

*Works of the Law are under the Curse: For it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the Book of the Law, to do them, Gal. 3. 10. which the Apostle quoteth from Deut. 27. 26. And hereunto Mr. Flavell himself gives a full Testimony in that forementioned Passage of his. And if he will not stand to what he hath there Asserted, but will needs shift it off by vain and groundless Distinctions; his Worthy Brethren in their forementioned Annotations shall Confront him, and Re-inforce the Truth which he hath there Asserted; when they tell us, upon 2 Cor. 3. 6. "That the Law was only a Revelation of the Will of God concerning Man's Duty; No Revelation of God's Grace, either in Pardoning Men their Omissions of Duty, doing Acts contrary to Duty; or assisting Men to the Performance of their Duty. So on the 7th Verse, "The Law only Cursed Man; shewed him no way how he should escape that Curse. It Killed Men, and led them to Eternal Death, and Condemnation, without shewing them any means of Life and Salvation. The like they tell us upon Gal. 3. 10, 12. where the Apostle tells us, that *that the Law is not of Faith, but the Man that doth these things shall Live in them.* Their Note upon which is this; "The Law, (say they,) saith nothing of Faith in the Mediator. Though Faith in God be com-*

" manded in the first Precept ; yet Faith in
 " Christ is not commanded by the Law, as
 " that by which the Soul shall live : For
 " that which the Law saith is, *Do this and*
 " *Live* ; Or the Man that doth the things
 " contained in the Law shall live in them.
 " Life in the Law is promised to those that
 " do the things which it requireth, not to
 " them who having failed in their perfor-
 " mances, yet accept of the Lord Jesus Christ,
 " as the Redeemer which God hath sent, and
 " believe in him who justifieth the Ungodly.
 And if all this be so, that the Law admitted
 not of Faith in the Redeemer, nor Repen-
 tance of Sin ; then let all Men judge whether
 my forementioned conclusion be not fully
 proved, that the Law could be no other than
 a Covenant of Works ; yea the very same for
 Substance with *Adam's* Covenant.

Argum. 4. That Covenant that had not
 Christ for the Mediatour of it, could never
 be a Covenant of Faith but of Works, yea the
 same for Substance with *Adam's* Covenant :
 But the Apostle speaking of the legal Cove-
 nant made with *Israel* at Mount *Sinai*, tells us,
 that *Christ hath obtained a more excellent Mini-*
stry. (*viz.* than that of *Moses*) by how much
 also he is the Mediatour of a better Testament,
 which was established upon better Promises. *Heb.*
 8. 6, 7, 8, 9. From whence it plainly follows
 that Christ was not the Mediatour of the
Sinai Covenant. Therefore that Covenant
 could

could never be a Covenant of Faith, but of Works; yea the same for Substance with that made with *Adam* himself.

Argum. 5. That Covenant that was not confirmed by the Blood of Christ (which alone can cleanse us from all unrighteousness) but onely by the Blood of Bulls, Goats and Calves, and the Ashes of an Heifer, sprinkling the unclean, which onely sanctified to the purifying of the Flesh, and could never take away Sins, nor make him that did the Service perfect as pertaining to the conscience; Could not be a Covenant of Faith, but of Works, the same for Substance with *Adam's* Covenant: But the Ceremonial Law was of this Nature and the Sacrifices thereof, wherewith alone it was dedicated. *Heb. 9. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. chap. 10. 1, 2, 3, 4. &c.* Therefore that Covenant could not possibly be a Covenant of Faith, but of Works: yea the same for Substance with *Adam's* Covenant.

Argum. 6. That Covenant that was not confirmed by the Blood of Christ, no nor so much as by the Blood of Bulls, or Goats, or Calves, could never be a Covenant of Faith, but of Works: yea the same for Substance with *Adam's* Covenant. But the Law written in Stones was so far from being confirmed by the Blood of Christ that it was never that we read of dedicated with any other sort of Blood whatsoever. *Ergo,*

But there are 3. Scriptures from whence you

will needs conclude that the *Sinai* Covenant is a Gospel Covenant, and consequently that it could not be a Covenant of Works. *Printed Reply.* p. 27, 28, 29, 30.

The First is, *Rom.* 10. 4. where the Apostle tells us, that Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness, to every one that Believeth. Which I have sufficiently Answered, and cleared in my former Discours, pag. 169. to pag. 172. from the corrupt Interpretation by you fastened thereon; which needs not here to be Repeated.

The Second is, *Act.* 7. 8. Where Stephens expression of the *lively Oracles*, which you say is to be understood concerning the Law delivered on Mount *Sinai*, doth no way prove that Covenant to be a Gospel Covenant, or that it was not therefore a Covenant of Works: For as much as *Paul* expressly affirms concerning the same Covenant, *Rom.* 7. 10. That *the Commandment which was Ordained to Life, be found to be unto Death.* 'Tis true the Apostle tells us, *Rom.* 10. 5. That *Moses describeth the Righteousness which is of the Law, that the Man which doth these things shall live by them.* But though the Law was ordained to life, and promiseth life upon condition of perfect obedience; yet since it cannot perform what it promiseth, in that *it is Weak through the Flesh*, it is far enough from being a Life giving Covenant, or a Covenant of Gospel Grace as you affirm it is: And
 accor-

accordingly the Apostle sets it rather in direct opposition to the Righteousness of Faith, or the Gospel Covenant in the following verses. And not onely so; but 2. Cor. 3, 6, 7. He expressly calls it a *Ministration of Death and Condemnation*, by way of opposition to the Gospel, which is, a *Ministration of Life and Righteousness*. So that Stephens forementioned expression of the *Lively Oracles*, no way serves your turn at all.

No more doth the third Scripture by you insisted on, *Rom. 9. 4*. Where the Law is numbred among the chief Priviledges in which God's *Israel* gloried: For though the Law is reckoned among their Chief Priviledges; since God had *shewed his Word unto Jacob; his Statutes and Judgments unto Israel*, which all other Nations wanted; yet this no way proves the Law to be therefore a Gospel Covenant: for as much as the Law, even as it is a Covenant of Works, was a Priviledg inestimable beyond what all others enjoyed. And the Reason is plain; because the very Curses and Punishments annexed thereunto, in case of the least Failure, were of excellent use to convince them of their Sin and Misery without Christ, and their necessity therefore of a Saviour, which was the proper Work of the Law, as a Covenant of Works: Which advantage all other Nations wanting, it might well be numbred among the Chief Priviledges: the *Israelites* were Invested with.

Your following Particulars being a Repetition of what you sent me formerly in Writing, have been already sufficiently Answered in my former Discourse, from P. 164. to P. 174.

Thus much for the Sinai Covenant.

S E C T. III.

IN the next place then ; As to what concerns the Covenant of Circumcision, I shall first lay down some Scripture Arguments, plainly proving that it was also a Covenant of Works, and of the same stamp with that at *Sinai* ; and then shall attend unto Mr. *Flavel*'s Arguments, whereby he now attempts the Proof of the contrary, viz. That it was a Gospel Covenant.

In the first place then ; Though I do acknowledge, that God did indeed make a Covenant of Grace with Believing *Abraham*, which is the great Charter by which Believing *Gentiles* always did and do claim both Heaven and Earth, and all the Promises they have Title to ; yet that the Covenant of Circumcision which God made with *Abraham*,
Gen.

Gen. 17: 7, 8, 9, 10. (though there was Grace in it, as there was in all the Covenants that God ever made with Men,) is not a Covenant of Grace properly so called, nor a Gospel Covenant whereof Christ is the Mediator; and consequently, that the *Gentiles* are not concerned therein, is thus proved,

Argum. 1. If that Covenant was as much a Covenant of Works as the *Sinai* Covenant before mentioned; yea, as much as the Covenant made with *Adam* in Innocency: Then it is not a Gospel Covenant whereof Christ is the Mediator: But it was as much a Covenant of works as either of the forementioned Covenants were. *Ergo,*

That *Adam's* Covenant was a Covenant of Works, cannot rationally be denied: For as much as Life was Implicitly Promised unto him upon his Obedience, and Death was Explicitly Threatned in case of his Disobedience. And upon these Terms he was to stand or fall: Which was plainly and undeniably a Covenant of Works, whereof Christ was not the Mediator. That the *Sinai* Covenant was of the same Nature, I have before fully proved, since it admitted not of Faith in the Redeemer, nor Repentance of Sin; it required Perfect Working under the pain of a Curse, accepted no short Endeavors, and gave no Strength. This I have already proved from Express Testimonies of Scripture, and the concurring Suffrage of many

many Worthy Divines ; from whence it is Evident, that the *Sinai* Covenant was the same for substance with that made with *Adam*, and is frequently therefore in the Scripture represented to us under the Denomination of the First, or Old, Covenant: There being therein a plain Manifestation of the Law written in the Heart of Man at the First.

Now that the Covenant of Circumcision is of the same stamp, is as Evident: For though God promiseth to be a God to *Abraham*, and to his Seed, *Vers.* 7, 8. as he did also in the *Sinai* Covenant to the same People in the Wilderness: yet still it was upon Condition of Obedience, with an Answerable Threatning in case of Disobedience. *Vers.* 9. *Thou shalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou and thy Seed after thee in their Generations.* *Vers.* 10. *This is my Covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy Seed after thee, every Man-child among you shall be Circumcised.* And *Vers.* 14. *The Uncircumcised Man-child whose Flesh of his fore-skin is not Circumcised, that Soul shall be Cut off from his People, he hath broken my Covenant.* The same Terms with the former. Besides, it is Evident, that Circumcision Indispensibly Obligated all that were under it to a Perfect Universal Obedience to the whole Revealed Will and Law of God. *Gal.* 5. 3. *For I Testifie to every Man that is Circumcised, that he is a Debtor to do the whole Law.*

Law. And if the *Sinai* Covenant was a Covenant of Works, as the Apostle doth plainly Affirm it is, *Rom.* 10. 5. why not that made with *Abraham* also, since the Terms are the same, as well as the Promises were the same?

If Mr. *Flavell* shall endeavour to shift off the Force of this Argument from *Gal.* 5. 3. as 'tis like he will, by telling me, that the Law was misinterpreted, and misunderstood by the *Jews*; and that Circumcision Obligated to a Perfect fulfilling of the whole Law only, as the Ignorance and Infidelity of Unregenerate Men make it to themselves, and not as God intended it: He may so do if he pleases; though he must know that Men of Reason will not suffer their Eyes to be blinded at so easie a rate. But for a further Answer hereunto, I must refer him to my *Reply* to Mr. *Whiston* upon the same subject; as also to what I have already said unto himself in reference hereunto in my foregoing Discourse about the *Sinai* Covenant; and shall accordingly proceed unto my Second Argument, which together with the rest that follow, I shall but mention in this place, lest I should Anticipate the necessary Confirmation of them, which I am obliged to produce in my *Reply* to Mr. *Whiston* in the latter part of this Discourse.

Argum. 2. That Covenant in which Faith was not reckoned to *Abraham* for Righteousness,

ness, could never be a Covenant of Faith. But the Scripture is Express, that Faith was not reckoned to *Abraham* for Righteousness, when he was in Circumcision, but in Uncircumcision, *Rom. 4. 9, 10. Ergo,*

Argum. 3. That which is Contradistinguished, or Opposed, unto the Righteousness of Faith, could never be a Covenant of Faith. But the Law, or Covenant of Circumcision, is by the Apostle plainly Opposed, or Contradistinguished, unto the Righteousness of Faith, *Rom. 4. 13. Ergo,*

By the way let it be Observed in reference to the Two foregoing Arguments; that I have already proved, that that Covenant that is not of Faith, must needs be a Covenant of Works, there being no Medium betwixt them; and consequently must needs be the same for substance with that made with *Israel* at Mount *Sinai*, and that made with *Adam* also.

Argum. 4. That Covenant that is plainly represented to us in Scripture as a Bondage Covenant, in and by which there was Imposed such a Yoak upon the Neck of the *Jews*, which neither those in the Apostles time, nor their Fathers, were able to bear; could be no other than a Covenant of Works, the same for substance with the *Sinai* Covenant. But the Scriptures do plainly declare, that such was the Nature of the Covenant of Circumcision, *Acts 15. 10. Gal. 5. 1, 2, 3. Ergo,* In

In the next place, though it might reasonably have been expected, that Mr. *Flavel* should have Answered these forementioned Arguments contained in my forementioned Discourse, so plainly proving, that the Covenant of Circumcision could be no other than a Covenant of Works; before he had produced any contrary Arguments for the proof of his Assertion, That the Covenant to which Circumcision belonged, neither was nor can be any other than a Covenant of Grace, the same we are now under; yet I shall not refuse to Cope with him in his own Method.

His First Argument then runs thus, *Printed Reply*, P. 42.

Argum. 1. If Circumcision be a part of the Ceremonial Law, and the Ceremonial Law was Dedicated by Blood, and whatsoever is so Dedicated is by you confessed not to be any part of the Covenant of Works: Then Circumcision is no part of the Covenant of Works, even by your own Confession. But it is so. *Ergo*,

Reply, But Sir, what if it be not so, that is, what if I do no where Confess, as you here say I do, that whatsoever is Dedicated by Blood is not any part of the Covenant of Works, what must the Conclusion be then? You know what was said of *Levy* of Old, *The Law of Truth was in his Mouth*, Mal. 2. 6. It had been well if you had written after his
Copy

Copy in this respect: For then you had not been guilty of Abusing your Neighbour after so gross a Rate, as you have in the present Point, as well as in many other Passages of your Book. For the Readers satisfaction therefore in our present Case, it is absolutely necessary that I give him a true and a naked Account of those several Passages in my Book, which you refer to when you come to the Proof of what you here Assert concerning my own Confession.

Mr. *Sedgwick* having Affirmed, (as the Reader will find his Objection stated P. 146. of my Discourse,) That that Covenant which was Confirmed by Blood and Sprinkling, (which Typified the Blood of Christ, Confirming and Ratifying the Covenant,) was no Covenant of Works, &c. I tell him by way of Reply, P. 147. First, That it is Evident, that the Covenant, the Blood whereof *Moses* Sprinkled on the People, mentioned *Exod.* 24. 7, 8. to which Mr. *Sedgwick* Refers could not possibly be the Law Written in Stones. And accordingly I prove it down along that Page, toward the latter end whereof I conclude, that the Law Written in Stones therefore could not possibly be the Covenant, the Blood whereof was so Sprinkled, but was indeed another Covenant, and delivered at a distinct Season, and in a distinct Method, &c. Accordingly, P. 148. I blame Mr. *Sedgwick* for making no distincti-

distinction between the Ceremonial Covenant that was Dedicated with Blood, and the Law Written in Stones that was not so Dedicated. For First, (say I,) he seems to take it for granted, that there was no other Covenant made with *Israel* at *Sinai*, but what was Confirmed by Blood. And Secondly, That that Covenant which was so Confirmed, must of necessity have been Confirmed also by the Blood of Christ Typified thereby, and therefore not a Covenant of Works. But both these, (said I,) are no other than ungrounded Suppositions that want a Foundation. For First, (as I there tell him,) It hath been already proved, that the Law Written in Stones had not been so much as Received from God, when the Ceremonial Covenant was so Confirmed. And accordingly it was so far from being Confirmed by the Blood of Christ, that we do not Read that it was ever Dedicated with any other sort of Blood whatsoever. Which I do further confirm from thence to the end of *P. 149.* And in the beginning of *P. 150.* I thence conclude, that it is therefore a great Mistake, for any to affirm, That the Law Written in Stones was not a Covenant of Works, because Confirmed by Blood and Sprinkling; whereas when it comes to be duly Examined, there appears no such matter.

Where

Where by the way, it may be Observed that I do not say, *the Covenant of Works* : But that it is a great Mistake; for any to affirm that the Law Written in Stones was not a *Covenant of Works*. Mr. *Flavell* tells me indeed that I make the Law Written in Stones to be *the Covenant of Works* : And he knew well enough, that that was an Emphatical Expression, plainly Intimating, that the Ceremonial Covenant was no Covenant of Works, and that this alone was it. But Mr. *Flavell* doth herein greatly Abuse me and himself too, which he could no other way Accomplish with any shadow of pretence, but by varying my Expression. And so, as I have before Noted, the alteration sometimes of one Letter, or Syllable, in a Sentence, shall render that to be Odd and Improper, which in it self is never so sound or substantial. Just thus Mr. *Flavell* deals with

Printed Reply.
P. 43.

me in the present Case, You make, (saith me,) *the Law Written in Stones the Covenant of Works*. Sir, I do not make it so, nor do I say so. I only say, that it was a *Covenant of Works*; and I do therefore so Express myself purposely respecting what follows in the same Page, where I tell you, that whereas the Apostle, *Heb. 9.* speaking of the Ceremonial Covenant which was Dedicated by Blood and Sprinkling, doth represent it to us under such Characters as he doth : From
all

all this, said I, it plainly appears, that even the Ceremonial Covenant it self could be no other than a Covenant of Works, as well as that Written in Stones. And accordingly, I tell you in the following *Page*, That though it is plain, that the Law Written in Stones, and the Book wherein the Statutes and Judgments were contained, were Two distinct Covenants, and delivered at distinct Seasons, and in a distinct Method; yet it is as clear from the Premises, that they were both of the same Nature, that is, no other than a Covenant of Works, and accordingly both now Repealed, and that under the Denomination of the First, or Old Covenant.

Now let the Candid Reader Judg upon the whole of this Discourse, (the substance whereof I have here truly and faithfully recited, not hiding the least Syllable that might make against me in this matter,) whether Mr. *Flavell* hath any just Reason to affirm, as he doth, That whatsoever is Dedicated by Blood, is by me confessed not to be any part of the Covenant of Works? Or let such as desire further satisfaction herein, take the Book it self, to which this refers, and see if they can there find any the least Syllable that hath any such kind of signification: Which yet Mr. *Flavell* is pleased to make the very Foundation of his forementioned Argument, and by which he endeavours to render me Ridiculous and Repugnant

nant to my self. "For if Circumcision,
 " (saith he,) be a part of the Ceremonial
 " Law, and the Ceremonial Law was Dedi-
 " cated by Blood, and whatsoever is so De-
 " dicated, is by you confessed not to be any
 " part of the Covenant of Works. Then
 " Circumcision is no part of the Covenant
 " of Works, even by your own confession.
 " But, (saith he,) it is so. *Ergo,*

But, Sir, I must tell you, that after this
 rate of Arguing, you seem to have taken a
 Liberty to say what you please, as if there
 were no future Judgment to be regarded. Sir,
 'tis plain matter of Fact that we are now con-
 tending about; and I appeal unto all that
 shall Impartially read my Discourse, whether
 I have not here given a Faithful Account
 thereof, so far as it relates to this matter.
 And if upon the whole, there do not appear
 the least shadow of pretence for you to affirm
 as you do, what Comfort can you expect ano-
 ther day, without Repentance now, when
 these things that have thus passed betwixt you
 and me, shall be again Revised and set in
 order before you?

Indeed, I am weary of noting your Mis-
 carriages of this kind; your Reply abounds
 with Transgressions of this nature. The Lord
 forgive you, and lay it not to your charge.

But whereas in the close of
 your Discourse, upon this Head,
 you tell me that the Truth I op-
 pose,

pose, *viz.* That the Book of the Ceremonial Law was sprinkled by Typical Blood, and therefore confirmed by the Blood of Christ, for the time it was to continue shines like a bright Sun-beam in my Eyes, from *Heb.* 9. 14, 23. I must tell you for a Close, That I do not oppose, but acknowledge, that the Ceremonial Law was sprinkled by Typical Blood: But I utterly deny, that it was therefore also confirmed by the Blood of Christ Typified thereby: For if it had, it would have made the Comers thereunto Perfect, as pertaining to the Conscience; which the Apostle expressly affirms, it could not, *vers.* 9. and *chap.* 10. 1. I need say no more as to that, and shall now therefore proceed to the Examination of your Second Argument.

Argum. 2. If Circumcision was a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, it did not pertain to the Covenant of Works; for the Righteousness of Faith and Works are opposites, and belong to two contrary Covenants. But Circumcision was the Seal of the Righteousness of Faith; *Rom.* 4. 11. *He, that is, Abraham, received the sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith.* Therefore it pertains not the Covenant of Works, but Grace. *Printed Reply, p. 45.*

Reply. Sir, by way of Answer hereunto, I must tell you, That when the Apostle tells us of *Abraham, Rom.* 4. 11. That *he received the Sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness*

ness of the Faith which he had yet being uncircumcised; from thence to infer, That the Covenant of Circumcision was a Covenant of Faith, and consequently, that Circumcision did not pertain to the Covenant of Works; would be point blank to contradict the whole scope and design of the Apostle in the foregoing Passages of that Chapter: Which, as it was in the general to prove, That *Abraham* was not justified by Works, but by Faith onely; *vers. 2, 3, 4, 5.* So in particular to assure us, That *Faith was not reckoned to him for Righteousness, when he was in Circumcision, but in Uncircumcision; Vers. 9, 10.* And what more convincing Testimony, or Evidence can we desire, that the Covenant of Circumcision was not a Covenant of Faith, but of Works? The Sign of Circumcision was indeed a Seal unto *Abraham* of the Righteousness of the Faith which he had in respect of the Promises made him yet being Uncircumcised: But it doth not therefore follow, that the Promises, *Gen. 17. 7, 8.* That God would be a God unto him, and his Seed after him, in their Generations, &c. upon Condition that He and His were Circumcised; were any part of the Covenant of Faith: For otherwise the Apostle would never have told us as he doth, That *Faith was not reckoned to him for Righteousness when he was in Circumcision, but in Uncircumcision.* The Argument hence resulting therefore, as I have already told
 You

you, is Irresistible. That Covenant in which Faith was not reckoned to *Abraham* for Righteousness, could never be a Covenant of Faith, and therefore must of necessity be a Covenant of Works: But the Scripture is expresse, That *Faith was not reckoned to Abraham for Righteousness, when he was in Circumcision, but in Uncircumcision.* Therefore the Covenant of Circumcision must needs be a Covenant of Works. Mr. *Whiston's* Cavils against which Argument, I have answered in its proper place.

Besides, it is evident, that long before his Circumcision, God had promised *Abraham*, to Bless him, to make his Name great; that he should be a Blessing; that in him should all the Families of the Earth be Blessed; that he should be the Father of many Nations, (or as the Apostle explains it, That he should be the Father of all them that believe) according to that which was spoken, so shall thy Seed be; Gen 12. 2, 3. Gen. 15. 5. And it is evident, that these were the Promises upon the account of which we are told, That he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for Righteousness; Gen. 15. 6. Circumcision therefore was a Seal onely to *Abraham*, and that of the Righteousness of the Faith which he had in respect of those peculiar Promises made him long before his Circumcision; and that for this very purpose, that he might be the Father of all them that Believe, which was his Prerogative alone: For none besides him, had ever before their Circumcision

Circumcision such a Faith which entituled them to such singular Promises.

So that though it must be acknowledged, that the forementioned Argument seems at first very plausible. *How can it be but that the Covenant of Circumcision must needs be a Covenant of Faith, since Abraham is said to have received the Sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith:* Yet we see when it comes to be duly examined, there appears no such matter. For, as this now mentioned Argument could be no way plausible, unless the following words, *Which he had yet being Uncircumcised,* were cut off from those that go before: So, the onely Argument fairly resulting from *Rom. 4. 11.* can be no other than this, That Covenant, or those Promises, in respect of which *Abraham* is said to have received the Sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, must needs be a Covenant of Faith. But the Scripture is expresse, That *Abraham received the Sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith which he had yet being Uncircumcised;* (which must of necessity be understood in respect of the forementioned Promises, that had been made him long before his Circumcision, and upon the account of which we are expressly told, That *he believed in the Lord, and he counted to him for Righteousness; Gen. 15. 6.*) Therefore that Covenant, or those Promises must needs be a Covenant of Faith. But then, as hath been already

already observed; it follows not that the Promises made unto him and his Seed after him, in their Generations, upon Condition of his and their Circumcision, mentioned Gen. 17. 7, 8, 9, 10. were any part of the Covenant of Faith, since the Apostle is expresse, *That Faith was not reckoned to him for Righteousness, when he was in Circumcision, but in Uncircumcision.*

Circumcision therefore, was a Seal onely to *Abraham*; and that in respect of the Promises made him yet being Uncircumcised, whereby he was confirmed in the assurance of that peculiar Prerogative that had been before conferred on him, and which the Apostle here expressly mentioneth. *He received, (saith he) the Sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith which he had yet being Uncircumcised, that he might be the Father of all them that believe.* In which respect it is evident, that Circumcision was that to the Father of the Faithful in its extraordinary Institution, and in his extraordinary Circumstances, that it could not be to any of his natural Progeny in its ordinary use. You tell me indeed, that this was *Bellarmino's* Invention, and that *Dr. Ames* hath fully confuted it. Unto which you add: " That
 " for me to restrain the publick
 " Seal of a Covenant that com-
 " prehended and equally concerned the whole
 " Church and People of God, to one single
 E " Person;

*Printed Reply,
 P. 46.*

" Person; so that neither *Isaac*, the Type of
 " Christ, nor *Jacob*, a Prince with God,
 " who were by name enrolled in that great
 " Charter, should have any right to the Seal
 " of it, is such a Conceit as amazes an In-
 " telligent Reader. But, Sir, I pray consi-
 der, can you justly or truly say, that *Isaac* or
Jacob either, are ever in Scripture called the
 Fathers of all them that Believe, as *Abraham*
 was? Or was it possible for them so to be,
 since this was *Abraham's* peculiar Prerogative
 to be so entituled? And doth the Apostle ex-
 pressly tell you of *Abraham*, That *he received*
the Sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteous-
ness of the Faith which he had while Uncircum-
cised, that he might be the Father of all them that
believe; which therefore could be the Privi-
 ledge of none else? Indeed there is nothing
 that can be more evident than this: For as it
 is absurd to say, that Circumcision was a Seal
 to all its Subjects, of the Righteousness of
 the Faith which they had while Uncircum-
 cised, as 'tis here said of *Abraham*; since ma-
 ny of them were never partakers of that Sa-
 ving Grace, whether before or after: So it is
 equally absurd to affirm, that it was *the*
Seal of a Paternal Relation to all Believers, un-
 to any that received it, as it was to *Abraham*,
 since neither *Isaac* nor *Jacob*, nor any besides,
 were ever, or could ever, be so dignified as
Abraham was.

And indeed, Circumcision was so far from
 being

being a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith to the rest that were under it, that it was rather unto them a token of Servitude and Bondage, and such a Yoke, that as the Apostles tell the Jews in their time, *Neither they nor their Fathers were able to bear it; Acts 15. 10, 24. Gal. 5. 2, 3.* which yet it had not been, had it been to them a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, or of the Gospel Covenant: For that brings with it true Christian Liberty and Freedom. And so much by way of Answer to your second Argument. Your third follows.

Argum. 3. In the Covenant of Circumcision, *Gen. 17.* God makes over himself to Abraham and his Seed, to be their God; and to give them a special Interest in himself: But in the Covenant of Works God doth not since the Fall, *Printed Reply.*
p. 48. make over himself to any to be their God by way of special Interest. Therefore the Covenant of Circumcision cannot be the Covenant of Works.

Reply. Sir, you are pleased to tell me, that this is so plain and so clear, that none can doubt or deny it that understands the nature of the two Covenants: But can you, indeed, upon second thoughts justly affirm, that God doth not in the Covenant of Works, since the Fall, make over himself to any to be their God by way of special Interest? How comes it then to pass, that in the *Sinai Cove-*
nant,

nant, which I have already proved, could be no other than a Covenant of Works, and which you your self have acknowledged to be materially such, the Lord doth expressly tell that People in the Wilderness, *Exod. 20. 2. I am the Lord thy God which have brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, out of the House of Bondage.* This was the very Introduction to that part of the Law which was written in Stones; which the Apostle doth yet nevertheless expressly call *A ministration of Death and Condemnation*; 2 Cor. 3. 7, 8, 9. And why? but because it required perfect Obedience, as the Condition of obtaining the Mercy (how Glorious or Comfortable soever in it self considered) therein promised, which was impossible to be performed by Man in his lapsed state; Gal. 3. 10, 11, 12. Rom. 3. 20. So that it is too apparent to be justly denied, but that God doth indeed, in the Covenant of Works, make over himself to Sinners to be their God in a way of special Interest; but it being upon such hard terms, that it is utterly impossible that way to attain unto Life; he hath therefore been pleased to abolish that, and to make a New Covenant, which is *not like, or not according* to the former, which was Conditional; but that which is wholly Free and Absolute; wherein he hath promised to put his Laws into our Minds, and to write them in our Hearts; and that he will be to us a God, and we shall be to him a People; Ezek. 36. Jer. 31. Heb. 8.

And

And this is a Covenant of Grace indeed, sure and certain, a Covenant truly Evangelical, and *not of the same Building* (as the Apostle speaks) with the *Sinai Covenant*, Heb. 9. 11.

The like may be as justly said in reference to the Covenant of Circumcision, as hath been now spoken in Reference to the *Sinai Covenant*. For though there were Promises in it that were full and glorious enough: *I will be a God to thee, and to thy Seed after thee, all the Land of Canaan for an everlasting possession, and I will be their God*; yet all these Promises, though good enough in themselves, being Conditional, they were therefore failable, and still liable to forfeiture, as they were contained in that Covenant: It being evident that it obliged all that were under it to perfect and universal Obedience as the Condition of obtaining the Mercies therein contained; Gal. 3. 3. From whence, as it is manifest that it could be no other than a Covenant of Works; so it is as evident, that it is not the Greatness or Goodness of the Promises contained therein, that can excuse it from being such, if Works be the Condition of obtaining the Mercies therein promised: For, as I have already told you, what else maketh, or wherein else consisteth the true Form or Nature of a Covenant of Works, but that Works be the Condition of it? This was the whole entire Nature of the first Covenant, which alone renders the it Essentially or Specifically Different

from the Promise of Grace, or the Gospel Covenant.

But all this, notwithstanding, you are pleased to tell me, "That it is so clear, that none can doubt or deny what you have asserted that understands the Nature of the two Covenants. And now, Sir, say you, what course do you take to avoid this Argument? Such a one, sure, as no Man that ever I met with took before you; and that is this, You boldly cut *Abraham's* Covenant, *Gen. 17.* into two parts, and make the first to be the pure Covenant of Grace, which is the Promisory part, to the 9th verse. And the Restipulation to be as pure a Covenant of Works. What a hard shift will some Men make to maintain their Opinions? You say truly (say you) p. 205. that at the 7th and 8th verses was their Restipulation; why then do you say p. 224. that at the 7th verse he proceeds to speak of another Covenant than what he had been speaking of before? Does the Promise and the Restipulation make two Covenants? Or are they just and necessary parts of one and the same Covenant? Sir, all this I have answered before, and there have plainly shewed you, how greatly you do here abuse me, and your self too, by a gross misrepresentation of my plain words and sense. The like you do in that which follows. "You also tell us (say you) that the

"Cove-

" Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 1, 2, 3, 4. was a plain
 " Transcript of several Free Promises of the
 " Gospel under the Denomination of a Co-
 " venant: but why then don't you take the
 " Restipulation; *vers.* 7, 8, 9, 10. to be a part
 " of it? The Nonsense of which Question, I
 have already also shewen you. But to this
 you make answer on my behalf. " Oh, no
 " (say you) there is something required on
 " *Abraham's* and his Posterities Part, and that
 " spoiles all. Well, after you have laughed
 in your Sleeve at my Answer of your own
 forming, you thus proceed; " Why but,
 " Sir, If the requiring of Circumcision al-
 " ters the Case so greatly as to make it a quite
 " contrary Covenant, how come it to pass,
 " that the Covenant to *Abraham* himself was
 " a pure Gospel Covenant, and yet *Abraham*
 " himself was first required to be Circumci-
 " sed? Thus runs this Passage in your Manu-
 " script Copy,

By way of Reply hereunto, I must tell
 you, Sir, That whether the requiring of Cir-
 cumcision alters the Case or no; I am sure
 you have quite altered the Scope of my Dis-
 course in reference hereunto: For as I do no
 where boldly cut the Covenant of Circumci-
 sion, *Gen.* 17. into two parts, and make the
 first to be a pure Covenant of Grace, which
 is the Promisory part to the 9th verse, and
 the Restipulation to be as pure a Covenant
 of Works? as you would make the World

believe I do: So yet nevertheless, I do plainly tell you, that though the Promise and the Restipulation mentioned *vers.* 7, 8, 9. make but one and the same Covenant of Circumcision; yet there are two Covenants mentioned in that Context. The first between God and *Abraham* himself, as I have already proved, *vers.* 2, 4. which could be made with no other. The other between God and *Abraham* and his natural Posterity also, *vers.* 7, 8, 9, 10. The former I call a Covenant of Grace, or a Gospel Covenant; wherein the Believing *Gentiles* are concerned: For (saith God, *ver.* 5.) *A Father of many Nations have I made thee.* Or as the Apostle explains it; *The Father of all them that believe*; that is, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*. The latter I call a Covenant of Works; which was made betwixt God and *Abraham*, and his natural Posterity onely; who were all of them by Vertue thereof to be Circumcised, as a token of their Obedience to the whole Law; which Ordinance of Circumcision doth not concern the *Gentiles* at all.

So that when you ask me; How comes it to pass, that the Covenant to *Abraham* himself was a pure Gospel Covenant, and yet *Abraham* himself was first required to be Circumcised? I must tell you, That your Question confounds the true state of the Question between us: For you know well enough, that I had made a Distinction of a twofold Covenant there mentioned; the one a Gospel, the other

other a Legal Covenant: And therefore this is no other than to turn things upside down; your general practice throughout your whole *Reply*. How comes it to pass, say you, that the Covenant to *Abraham* himself was a pure Gospel Covenant? I will tell you, Sir, how it came to pass, if you rightly understand what you should Question me about. If by the pure Gospel Covenant, you mean the Covenant mentioned, *vers.* 2, 4. I Answer; It came to pass as the fruit of Gods own Free Grace and Mercy, and that both unto *Abraham* himself, and to the Believing *Gentiles* also that are concerned therein. But then, say you, How comes it to pass, that *Abraham* himself was first required to be Circumcised, if the Covenant to *Abraham* himself was a pure Covenant? By way of Answer, I must tell you, that *Abraham* was required to be Circumcised by the Command of God, as a token of the Covenant of Works he was pleased to make with him; *vers.* 7, 8, 9, 10. And that even after the establishment of the formentioned Gospel Covenant; *ver.* 2, 4. which how harsh, or unlikely soever it may seem unto Mens Carnal Reason, as if the latter must needs make void the former, as you after tell me, the Apostle will give a quite contrary Resolution of the present point; *Gal.* 3. 17. And this I say, that the Covenant which was confirmed before of God in Christ, the Law which was 430 years after, cannot disannul that

it should make the Promise of none effect. The like whereunto may be as justly said in reference to the Covenant of Circumcision, which God made with *Abraham*, after the Confirmation and Establishment of the forementioned Gospel Covenant. The latter doth not, cannot disannul the former, that it should make the Promise of none effect; since the Grace of the one prevailed, and did by far supersede the Force and Power of the other: For so the Apostle himself resolves the Point in reference to the Law; *Rom. 5. 20. The Law entered, saith he, that Sin might abound: But where Sin hath abounded, Grace did much more abound.*

Well, but if there is something required as a Condition in the Covenant of Circumcision, which quite alters the nature of that Covenant, from the Gospel Covenant before spoken of (so you should have stated the case, but that I can meet with nothing but crookedness, throughout the whole of your present Reasonings) “Tell

Printed Reply,
p. 50.

“me then, say you, why you say, p. 223, that the Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Gen. 12.* was a Gospel Covenant; “and yet there *Abraham* is obliged to walk “before God and be Perfect? Does not that “also there alter the nature of the Covenant, “as well as here in the 17th chapt?

Reply, Something you would say though you know not what. For the whole of your

Reply

Reply is full of Mistakes, and Mis-representations. Sometimes, nay twenty, and twenty times over, you Mis-represent my plain Words and Sense. Here you mistake, and Mis-represent the Scripture it self; for in *Genesis* the Twelfth, there is no such word there at all mentioned; as an Obligation upon *Abraham*, to walk before God and to be Perfect, as you affirm there is, nor any thing of that Nature. And there being no such thing there expressed, how can that alter the Nature of that Covenant from being a Gospel Covenant? Which Proof failing, you are so far to seek of a Material Advantage you thought you had against me.

Well, but somewhere 'tis, if it be not in the 12th of *Gen.* 'tis in the 17th. "And you also grant, say you, that the Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 22. was a pure Gospel Covenant: Or if you deny it the Apostles proves it, *Heb.* 6. 13. And yet there is more appearance of Respect to *Abraham's* Obedience in that Covenant, than is in submitting to Circumcision. See *Gen.* 22. 16, 17. *By my self have I Sworn, saith the Lord: For because thou hast done this thing, &c. that in Blessing I will Bless thee, and in Multiplying I will Multiply thee,* Printed Reply. P. 30.

Reply, It is Observable; that the Apostle, *Heb.* 6. 13. designing to give an Account and Commendation of the Faith and Obedience of

of *Abraham*, sutable to his then present Discourse to the *Hebrews*, calls not out that Grant of the Gospel Promise, which was Preventing and Calling, Antecedent unto all his Faith and Obedience, and Communicative of all the Grace whereby he was enabled thereunto, as it is Expressed, *Gen. 12. 1, 2, 3.* But he takes it from that place where it was Renewed and Establiſhed unto him, after he had given the last and greatest Evidence of his Faith, Love, and Obedience. *Gen. 22. 16, 17, 18.* *By my self have I Sworn, saith the Lord: For because thou hast done this thing, and hast not with-held thy Son, thine only Son, that in Blessing I will Bless thee, and in Multiplying I will Multiply thee, and in thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be Blessed;* which is a plain Rehearsal of those Absolute, Gospel Promises of the same Nature that had been before made unto him, *Gen. 12. 2, 3.* In which respect it is also further Observable, that even *Abraham* himself, at the very time of his Call, mentioned *Gen. 12.* seems to have been tainted with the common Idolatry which was then in the World. This Account we have, *Josh. 24. 2, 3.* *Your Fathers dwelt on the other side of the Flood in old time; even Terah the Father of Abraham, and the Father of Nachor, and they Served other Gods. And I took your Father Abraham from the other side of the Flood.* It is true, the charge is Express against *Terah* only; but it lying against their

their Fathers in general, on the other side of the Flood, *Abraham* seems to be Involved in the guilt of the same Sin, whilst he was in his Fathers House, and before his Call. Nor is there any Account given of the least Preparation, or Disposition, in him unto the State and Duties, which he was afterward brought into. In this Condition God of his Sovereign Grace, first, calls him to the saving Knowledge himself, and by degrees Accumulates him with all the Favours and Priviledges afterward Conferred on him. From hence, in the close of his whole Course, he had no Cause to glory in himself, neither before God, nor Men, *Rom. 4. 2.* For he had nothing but what he Gratiouſly Received. Indeed there were distances of time in the Collation of ſeveral diſtinct Mercies and Bleſſings on him ; and he ſtill through the ſupplies of Grace which he received under every Mercy, ſo deſorted himſelf, as that he might not be unmeet to receive ſucceeding Mercies. Which is the conſtant Method of God's Communicating his Grace to Sinners. His firſt Call and Converſion of them is Absolutely Gratiouſ. He hath no Conſideration of any thing in them, that ſhould induce him thereunto. Neither is there any thing required unto a Condeſcency herein. God takes Men as he pleaſeth ; ſome in Condition and Poſture of Mind ; ſome in another ; ſome in an open courſe

of Sin, and some in the execution of a particular Sin, as *Paul*; and he indeed at the Instant of his Call, was under the Active Power of Two of the greatest hinderances unto Conversion, that the Heart of Man is Obnoxious unto. For first, he was Zealous above measure of the Righteousness of the Law, seeking earnestly for Life and Salvation by it; and then he was Actually Engaged in the Prosecution of the Saints of God. Those Two Qualifications, Constant Resting in Legal Righteousness; with Rage and Madness in Persecution, than which, there are not out of Hell more Adverse Principles unto it, were all the Preparations of that Apostle unto Converting Grace. But after that this Grace which in the First Discovery thereof is absolutely Free and Sovereign is received, there is an Order 'tis true, which for the most part God Observeth in the Communication of ensuing Graces and Priviledges; namely, that Faith and Obedience shall Precede the Increase and Inlargement of them. Thus it was with *Abraham* in the Instance before us, who received this last great signal Promise and Priviledg, *Gen. 22.* upon that signal Act of his Faith and Obedience in Offering up his Son upon God's Command.

But yet nevertheless; In the first place 'tis Evident, that the Gospel Covenant in the First Discovery thereof, is wholly Free and
 Absolute.

Absolute. So it was to *Abraham*, *Gen. 12. 1, 2, 3.* where there is no such Obligation laid upon *Abraham*, to walk before God and to be Perfect, as you Affirm there was; which nevertheless you Insinuate was the Condition or Qualification then required of him in order to his Participation of the Gospel Mercies there Promised him. If God had indeed there told *Abraham*, as you suggest he did: That he would Bless him, and make him a Blessing, &c. provided he walked before God and was Perfect: Then it had been a Covenant of Works as much as the Covenant of Circumcision was; which obliged both Him and His to do the whole Law. But as I have already told you, there is nothing of that Nature there to be found, God only tells him, *Vers. 1. Get thee out of thy Country, and from thy Kindred, and from thy Father's House, unto a Land that I will shew thee; and I will make of thee a great Nation, and I will Bless thee, &c.* which is far from that Perfection, which you say God there Obligated him to. 'Tis true afterward, this charge was laid upon him. *Gen. 17. 1. I am the Almighty God, walk before me and be thou Perfect.* For God requireth many things of them whom he Actually takes into Covenant, and makes Partakers of the Promises and Benefits of it. Of this Nature is that whole Obedience which is prescribed unto us in the Gospel, in our walking before God in Uprightness.

There

There being an Order in the things that belong herunto: Some Acts, Duties and Parts, of our Gracious Obedience being appointed to be Means of the further Additional Supplies of the Grace and Mercies of the Covenant. Of this Nature is that General Obligation here laid upon *Abraham*, Gen. 17. 1. *Walk before me and be thou Perfect*; and hereunto also appertaineth that famous Act of his Obedience mentioned Gen. 22. 16, 17. But then it follows not, that the Gospel Covenant is a Conditional Covenant: For as it is wholly Free and Absolute in the First Discovery thereof; so it is as Free and Absolute still. From the Foundation to the Topstone thereof, 'tis all of the same Piece. And the Reason is, because whatever Duties God requireth of us, in order to the Enjoyment of the full end of the Covenant in Glory; yet even those Duties or Acts of Obedience which God thus requireth of us, must be Performed by us, if they be Performed aright, in and by vertue of the First Grace of the Covenant already received, Col. 2. 6, 7. *As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord; so walk ye in him, Rooted and Built up in him, and stablished in the Faith as ye have been Taught.* So likewise, Gal. 3. 2, 3. *This only would I Learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the Works of the Law, or by the Hearing of Faith? Are ye so Foolish, having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made Perfect by the Flesh; which First Grace*

of the Covenant must therefore also be continued and *Renewed* upon us *Day by Day* : Else we shall certainly Faint and Perish in our own Corruption at last, 2 Cor. 4. 16. *Psal.* 36. 10.

In this respect it is Evident, that the Gospel Covenant is so far from being at all Conditional, that it is expressed in the Nature and Form of a Promise throughout the Scripture. Thus it was to our First Parents soon after the Fall ; a Promise, that the Seed of the Woman should overcome the Devil and his Seed. No Terms, no Conditions added, but a bare Declaration of a Way of Mercy to their Dejected, Self-condemned, Consciences. Next when the Covenant was Revealed to *Abraham*, Gen. 12. 2, 3. It is a Formal Absolute Promise, that God would Bless him and all Nations in his Seed. And ever after it is called the Promise made to *Abraham*, which *Israel* waited to see accomplished. And so the Apostle stiles it in the forementioned *Heb.* 6. 13. *when God made Promise to Abraham, saying, Surely in Blessing I will Bless thee, &c.* And accordingly the Apostle, *Gal.* 3. 18. affirms, that the Inheritance was given to *Abraham* by Promise and not by Law : For, saith he, *If the Inheritance be of the Law, it is no more of Promise; but God gave it to Abraham by Promise; which clearly Argues the Absoluteness of this Gospel Covenant : For wherein differs the Law from*

from a Free Promise, but that the one is Conditional, the other Absolute; the one Promiseth Life upon Condition of Obedience, the other without Money and without Price. The like doth the same Apostle tell us, *Rom. 4. 13, 14, 15, 16. For the Promise that he should be the Heir of the World, was not to Abraham, or to his Seed, through the Law, but through the Righteousness of Faith: For if they which are of the Law be Heirs, Faith is made void, and the Promise made of none Effect. And why? Because the Law worketh Wrath. And how doth the Law work Wrath? Why, as it is a Conditional Covenant, wherein alone it is opposed unto the Promise, which is Free and Absolute: For as the Apostle rightly adds, Where no Law is there is no Transgression; that is, where no Conditions are added, there can be no Violation, or Breach of Covenant. And consequently, It is therefore of Faith, that it might be by Grace, to the end the Promise might be sure to all the Seed; which else it could not be: For if any Conditions be added, though never so mild and gentle, we are still in hazard. Nay, had it been so, it would have rendred the Gospel Covenant worse then that made with Adam himself: Since we have now no strength to Obey, nor Power to fulfil these Conditions, though in the least, or lowest degree; no not so much as to a thought. So Paul acknowledgeth of himself, and that even after his acquaintance with New Cove-*

nant

nant Mercy, 2 Cor. 3. 5. Not, saith he, *that we are sufficient of our selves to think any thing as of our selves*; whereas Adam was furnished with a Capacity sufficient for the discharge of the most Perfect Obedience.

And if you say, that God requireth nothing of us but what he giveth Strength and Grace to Perform, having Promised to put his Laws in our Hearts, &c. This doth but so much the more clearly Evince the Absoluteness of the Gospel Covenant: Since the Gospel Promise can depend on no Condition on our part: For as I have already told you in reference to the first Discovery of New Covenant Mercy; whatever is Antecedent thereunto, being only a Work, or Act, of Corrupted Nature, can be no Condition whereon the Dispensation of Spiritual Grace is superadded. And indeed so it is also even in reference to the after Discoveries thereof: *Since in us, that is, in our Flesh there dwelleth no good thing.* So Paul himself acknowledgeth concerning himself, even after his Conversion unto God. Rom. 7. 18. *For to will, saith he, is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not.* So that as it was at first with us, so it is still, further than the Free, Sovereign and Absolute, Grace of the Covenant is still set at Work for our Relief. Thus it was with Paul himself. He could find no Condition, or Pre-disposition, in himself to Plead it out with God, why the further

further Dispensations of Spiritual Grace should be afforded unto him. *Our sufficiency,* saith he, *is not of our selves. In me, that is, in my Flesh dwelleth no good thing. How to perform that which is good I find not. The good that I would I do not, but the evil which I would not that I do; and when I would do good, evil is present with me.* In respect whereof; let who will betake themselves to the Pharisees Plea, *God I thank thee, I am not as other Men.* For my own part, I am resolved to make use of none other but that of the poor Publican, *Lord be Merciful to me a Sinner.*

Upon the whole you see that the Apostle expressly Affirms, that the Inheritance was given to *Abraham* by Promise, not by Law. And you can Assign no other Difference betwixt the Law and the Promise, but that the one was Conditional, the other Absolute. From whence it unavoidably follows, that the Gospel Covenant made with *Abraham*, was wholly Free and Absolute. So it was at first, and so it is at last, *Rom. 4. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.*

But I have so far anticipated what I have to offer by way of opposition to your following Arguments concerning the conditionality of the Gospel Covenant, which I intend Anon to take distinctly to task. In the mean Season you tell me you'll trouble me on this Head, but with one Query more, and that is this,

this. " If the four first verses of the 17th. Gen. contain a pure Gospel Covenant, and the Restipulation in the following verses make a Covenant of Works, because it thereby becomes conditional, still crookedness. For is there nothing but Restipulation in the following verses? Do not the 7th. and 8th. vers. contain the Promises of the Covenant of Circumcision, distinct from the Restipulation, mentioned, vers. 9, 10? Well, but what then?) Then tell me, say you, if you please; " Whether what God granted to *Abraham* in " the former verses, be not all nulled and " made void again by their Restipulation? No, say I, if the Question be stated a right. The Gospel Covenant mentioned, vers. 2. 4, 5, 6. cannot be nulled or made void by the Covenant of Circumcision that followed after, and is accordingly mentioned, vers. 7, 8, 9, 10. And my Reason is the same the Apostle gives in Reference to the Law, Gal. 3. 17. *The Covenant which was Confirmed before of God in Christ, the Law which was 430, Years after cannot Disannul that it should make the Promise of none effect.* The like may be said in reference to the Covenant of Circumcision, as I have already told you. And therefore how harsh soever it may seem unto you, as you say it doth, withal telling me, that I have brought *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, and all the Believers of *Abraham's Race*, just into the same case I brought *Moses* and all the *Israelites* before, under

under two opposite Covenants, where one cut's off all that the other granted; Yet as I have already detected the vanity of this Notion of yours, that the one of these Covenants cut's off all that the other granted. And as I have already also plainly and justly Returned the same Absurdity which without cause you charge on my Doctrine, on your own, in respect of *Moses*: So I may as justly, and for the same Reason, in respect of *Abraham* also.

“ But, say you, There is a stronger reason
 “ urged than the conditionality of the Cove-
 “ nant to prove it a Covenant of Works, and
 “ that is Circumcision is made the condition
 “ of *Abraham's* Covenant, and that's the worst
 “ of all conditions; for it obliges a Man to
 “ keep the whole Law, *Gal. 5. 3.* 'tis the yoke
 “ of Bondage, and to whatsoever Covenant it
 “ be so annexed, it makes it become a Bondage
 “ Legal Covenant. If we be Circumcised
 “ Christ shall profit us nothing. *Printed*
Reply, pag. 51.

Reply. Sir, you seem to Express your self in this Paragraph at a scoffing rate. Circumcision, say you, is made the Condition of *Abraham's* Covenant, and that's the worst of all Conditions. But as I have already told you, however you deal with me, you must withall remember, God's truth will not be so mocked. Great use you tell me is made of those Scriptures by you now mentioned, in many parts
 of

of my Discourse, but that I am greatly mistaken in applying those texts to the purposes I do, for that the Apostle all along in the Epistle to the *Galatians*, argues against the false Teachers who taught and pressed the necessity of Circumcision, as a bond obliging them to the strict and perfect obedience of the Law, in order to their Justification thereby. And withal you tell me of the Circumcision of *Timothy*, which had not been in case Circumcision had bound Men to keep the Law for justification.

Reply. As for *Paul's* compliance with the *Jews* in the Circumcision of *Timothy*, however the case stood in that respect; This is certain that the Blessed Apostle would never have expressed himself with that vehemency as he doth, *Gal. 5. 2, 3. For I testify again to every Man that is Circumcised, that he is a Debtour to the whole Law.* If this had been onely the sense of the *Jewish* Teachers, or the Opinion that they had concerning the nature of Circumcision, as you would have it. It being plain that he expresseth it as his own Sense in reference to the true nature of that Covenant: No way contradicting theirs; which yet without doubt he would have done, had not this been the true state of the Case. From whence therefore the conclusion is evident, that it could be no other than a Covenant of Works, as that at *Sinai* was. You are pleased to tell me indeed, that Circumcision in its
own

own nature did not oblige to the keeping
 of the whole Law, but from the intention
 of the Agent. But the Apostle saith not so.
 This is onely your corrupt Gloss upon that
 Text. The Apostle tells us expressly. *If ye
 be Circumcised, you are Debtours to do the whole
 Law.* Plainly shewing that let Men designe
 what they will, this is the true nature of the
 thing in it self. Had *Paul* expressed himself
 as you do, the Case had been clear on your
 part; but for you to impose your Conceits
 as of equal validity with Scripture Dictates
 'tis not to be endured. If the Work-man's
 hand were his Rule, 'tis certain he could ne-
 ver Erre in Working. And if your Gloss
 were as Authentick as the Text, you could
 never Erre in the Interpretation: But 'tis
 well we have a more sure word of Prophecy
 to Rely upon than your bare *Ipse dixit*, or
 Arbitrary Dictates.

I now come to your fourth and last Argu-
 ment, whereby you pretend to prove that the
 Covenant of Circumcision, could be no Co-
 venant of Works, which I find thus formed.
Printed Reply, pag. 55.

Argum. 4. That which teacheth Man the
 corruption of his nature by Sin, and the mor-
 tification of Sin by the Spirit of Christ, can-
 not be a condition of the Covenant of Works.
 But so did Circumcision that in the direct
 and Primary end of it. *Ergo.*

Reply. By way of Answer hereunto, I shall
 need

need onely to tell you, that you must first prove the Law, or *Sinai* Covenant, to be no Covenant of Works, but a Gospel Covenant, before you can prove the Covenant of Circumcision to be such, by this Argument : Since there were many things belonging to the Law, as the Passover, and several other Sacrifices, wherewith that Covenant was dedicated, besides many other Types, which were annexed, as Appendages unto the Legal Administration, under which were veiled many Spiritual Mysteries, relating to Christ the true and onely Sacrifice, as also concerning the Mortification of Sin by the Grace and Spirit of Christ ; Which yet do not therefore prove it to be a Gospel Covenant, as hath been already declared and made Evident in my foregoing Discourse upon that Subject ; which when I see Substantially refuted, I will then grant with you that the present Argument is convincing to the end for which it is Designed.

S E C T. I V.

I Shall in the next place therefore proceed unto the third Point; and that is concerning the Conditionality of the New Covenant. In reference whereunto that Notion of yours,

F that

that there is in it *something as an Act required of us in point of Duty, which is Antecedent to the Benefit of the Promise*: I have already Examined and

Printed Reply.
P. 61.

Discussed in my foregoing Discourse, which needs not here to be repeated. Your first Argument for the proof whereof runs thus; *Printed Reply, p. 65.*

Argum. 1. If we cannot be Justified or Saved till we believe; then Faith is the Condition on which these consequent Benefits are suspended: But we cannot be Justified or Saved till we believe, *Ergo.*

Reply. Before I give a direct Answer to the present Argument, there are some things necessary to be Premised in order thereunto.

In the first place then; as to what concerns the Quality of the New Covenant, whereof we are now to treat, whether it is wholly Free and Absolute or Conditional? It ought to be duely observed, that in the Account or Description that is given us thereof, both by *Jeremy*, and the Author to the *Hebrews*, *Jer. 31. Heb. 8.* it is too evident to be justly deny'd, but that the whole of the New Covenant is there expressed: For if it were otherwise, it could not be proved thence, that this Covenant was more excellent than the former; especially as to Security that the Covenant Relation between God and that People should not be broken or disannulled: For this is the principal thing which the Apostle designs

signs to prove, *Heb. 8.* where the New Covenant is for this very purpose industriously and punctually recited and compared with the Old. The want of a due observation whereof hath led many out of the way in their Exposition of it. If therefore this be not an entire Description of the Covenant, there might yet be something reserved, essentially belonging thereunto, which might frustrate the End: For some such Conditions might yet be required in it, as we are not able to observe; or could have no security that we should abide in the observation of them, and thereon this Covenant might be frustrated of its End as well as the former, which is directly contrary unto God's Declaration of his Design in it.

Secondly, It is evident, that there can be no Condition previously required unto our entering into our participation of the Benefits of this Covenant, Antecedent unto the making of it with us: For none think there can be any such with respect unto its Original Constitution, nor can there be so, in respect of its making with us: For first, this would render this Covenant Inferiour in a way of Grace unto that which God made with the People at *Sinai*: For he declares, that there was not any thing in them that moved him either to make that Covenant, or to take them into it with himself. Every where he asserts this to be an Act of his meer Grace and Favour:

Yea, he frequently declares, that he took them into that Covenant not onely without Respect unto any thing of good in them; but although they were evil and stubborn. See *Deut.* 7. 7, 8. *chap.* 9. 4, 5. Secondly, It is contrary unto the Nature, Ends, and Express Properties of this New Covenant; for there is nothing that can be thought or supposed to be such a Condition, but it is comprehended in the Promise of the Covenant it self: For all that God requireth in us is proposed as that which himself will effect by vertue of this Covenant.

Thirdly, Though there is nothing that can be thought or supposed to be such a Condition of the Covenant, but it is comprehended in the Promise of the Covenant it self; yet it is certain, that in the outward Dispensation thereof, wherein the Grace and Mercy of it is proposed unto us, many things are required of us in order unto a Participation or Enjoyment of the full End of the Covenant in Glory: For God hath ordained, that the full extent of that Grace and Mercy that is prepared in it, shall be communicated unto us ordinarily, in the use of outward means, wherewith a Compliance is required of us in a way of Duty. To this end hath he appointed all the Ordinances of the Gospel, his Word and positive Institutions, with all those Duties publick and private, which are needful to render them effectual to us: For
he

he expects the Service of the Rational Faculties of our Natures, that he may be glorified in them and by them; which yet cannot be properly called Conditions of the Covenant. For First, God doth work the Grace of the Covenant, and communicate the Mercy of it antecedently unto all Ability for the performance of any such Duty. Secondly, Amongst those who are equally diligent in the performance of the Duties intended, he makes a Discrimination, preferring one before another. *Many are called, but few are chosen.* And what hath any Man that he hath not received? Thirdly, He actually takes some into the Grace of the Covenant whilst they are engaged in an opposition unto the outward dispensation of it. An Example of this Grace he gave in *Paul*. From all which it is evident, that the principal Grace of the Covenant, or God's putting his Laws in our Hearts, which is influential to all the rest can depend on no condition on our Part.

These things then being thus premised; the Answer which I shall return unto the fore-mentioned Argument is this;

First, That it is evident that unto a full and compleat enjoyment of all the Promises of the Covenant, Faith on our part, from which Evangelical Repentance is inseparable, is required: But then it must withal be considered, that these also are wrought in us, given to us, and bestowed upon us, by vertue

of that Promise and Grace of the Covenant, that depends on no Condition in us, which renders it wholly free and absolute from the Foundation to the Topstone thereof. Whereas therefore you are pleased to tell me, That there is something as an Act required of us in point of Duty, which is Antecedent to the Benefit of the Promise. If you intend hereby, that Faith, from which Evangelical Repentance and Good Works are inseparable, is such a Condition of the Covenant, as to be by us performed Antecedently unto the participation of any Grace, Mercy, or Benefit of it, as your words imply (for you admit of no Benefit from the Covenant till this be performed.) It is most untrue, and as I have already told you, 'tis not onely contrary to the expresse Testimonies of Scripture, but destructive of the Nature of the Covenant itself: For if so, Men must do all those things before they receive the Remission of Sins: Yea, while they are as yet dead in Trespases and Sins. Yea then must they do them whilst they are under the Law, and the Curse of it: For so are all Men whose Sins are not pardoned. But this is to make Obedience unto the Law, and that to be performed by Men whilst under the Curse of it to be a Condition of Gospel Mercy, which is to overthrow both the Law and the Gospel.

“How notoriously false and absurd is that
 “Doctrin which asserteth the possibility of
 Believing

Believing without the efficacy of Supernatural Grace? (saith Mr. *Flavel* himself, p. 395. of his forementioned Book, entituled, *The method of Grace*) "the desire of Self-sufficiency," saith he, was the ruin of *Adam*, and the conceit of Self-sufficiency is the ruin of multitudes of his Posterity. This Doctrine, saith he, is not only contradictory to the current stream of Scripture, *Psal. 2. 13. 1 Jo. 1. 13.* with many other Scriptures; but it is also contradictory to the common Sense and Experience of Believers; yet, saith he, the Pride of Nature will strive to maintain, what Scripture and Experience plainly contradict and overthrow.

I shall need to make no other Descant upon these words of his, but this. If that Doctrine is notoriously false and absurd which asserteth the possibility of Believing without the efficacy of Supernatural Grace: Then so is that Doctrine which asserteth, that Faith is required of us in point of Duty, antecedent to the benefit of the Promise.

Secondly, If Jesus Christ fulfilled the Law, and purchased Heaven and Happiness for Men (as all true Protestants hitherto have taught) then nothing can remain but to declare this to them, to incline them to believe and accept it; and to prescribe in what way, and by what means they shall finally come to inherit Eternal Life: To affirm therefore, that Faith and Repentance are the Conditions of

the New Covenant, required of us in point of Duty antecedent to any Benefit of the Promise, doth necessarily suppose, that Christ hath not done all for us, nor purchased a right to Life for any, but onely made way, that they may have it upon certain terms; or as some say, He hath merited that we might merit. But the Conditions of the Covenant are not to be performed by the Head and Members both. The Scriptures do assure us, That *when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a Woman, made under the Law, to redeem them that were under the Law, that we might receive the Adoption of Sons; Gal. 4. 4.* Christ therefore having in our stead performed the Conditions of Life, there remains nothing but a Promise, and the Obedience of Children, as the Fruit and Effect thereof to them that believe in him; together with means of obtaining the full possession which here we want.

Well, but as under the Old Covenant Man was bid to *do this and live*: So under this New Covenant he is commanded to Believe and live. And as Death was threatened to the failure of Obedience to the Law: So it is now threatened to the want of Faith under the Gospel: Faith being the Condition on which the consequent Benefits of Life and Salvation are suspended; *Mar. 16. 15, 16. Go preach the Gospel. He that believeth and is Baptized, shall be saved. He that believeth not shall be damned. Jo. 3. 36. He that believeth on the Son hath ever-*

everlasting Life, and he that believeth not shall not see Life. Where Faith seemeth to be put into the room of perfect Obedience, and therefore to be as proper a Condition of Life as that was. So Rom. 10. 9. *That if thou shalt confess with thy Mouth, and believe in thine Heart, thou shalt be saved.* Mat. 18. 3. *Except ye be converted and become as little Children, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven* Mar. 11. 26. *But if ye forgive not, neither will your Heavenly Father forgive you.* With multitudes more, saith Mr. Flavel, of such kind of Expressions which are all Conditional Particles, inserted into the Grants of Benefits; it being not possible to put words into a frame more lively expressive of a Condition than these are.

Reply. First, whereas it is supposed, that Faith under the Gospel seemeth to be put into the room of Perfect Obedience unto the Law, and therefore to be as proper a Condition of Life as that was: This cannot be, for as much as it is Christ's Perfect Obedience onely, which is put into the room of ours to justify and save us, as our own should have done, had we been able to perform it. And so his Sufferings take away the Curse which our Disobedience brought upon us.

Secondly, It must also be observed, that God having promised Salvation upon the account of his Sons satisfaction to all that come to him or believe in him; Faith is therefore no other than a Coming, Believing, or

Trusting in this Promise of God, and so in the Righteousness of Christ exhibited in the Promise, whereby it is applied unto us. Wherefore Faith is not properly put into the room of Perfect Obedience, nor doth it what Perfect Obedience was to do, which was to be the *Condition of Life*: For though that was to be our Righteousness under the Law; yet it is evident, that Faith on the other hand, is appointed onely as an *Instrument* to receive and apply the Righteousness of Christ, which is the alone matter of our Justification before God. For indeed, Faith it self is not our Righteousness, as it would be, if it were as you affirm it is, the Condition of the New Covenant; and that as an Act or Work required of us in point of Duty, antecedent to the Benefit of the Promise: For that would be to make an Act or Work of our own to be the formal matter of our Justification before God; but this it is not, it being only designed as an Instrument to receive and apply the Righteousness of another: Even that wrought in the person of Christ for us, which is wholly distinct from our own, or any thing wrought in us, or done by us; *Phil. 3. 9. Tit. 3. 5.*

You tell us indeed in your forementioned Book, Entitled, *The Method of Grace*, P. 133, 134. That though Faith is a Condition of the Covenant, yet you cannot allow, that it Justifies as a Condition. And why? Be-
cause

cause, (as you there also tell us,) you cannot see according to this Opinion any Reason, why Repentance may not as properly be said to Justifie as well as Faith : For, (say you there,) Repentance is a Condition of the New Covenant as much as Faith : And, (say you) If Faith justify as a Condition, then not onely Repentance, but every other Grace, that is a Condition, must justify as well as Faith. And, say I, 'tis very true. If Faith is a Condition of the New Covenant, Repentance is a Condition as much as that, and so are all other Graces, Conditions of the New Covenant, as well as Faith and Repentance. This cannot be avoided ; And if all these are the Conditions of the New Covenant, why they should not justify as Conditions ; I see not, nor I think you, nor any Man else : For you give no other Reason why you cannot allow that Faith justifies as a Condition, but that this will necessarily bring in Repentance and all other Graces to justify as Conditions also, as well as Faith : as indeed it doth ; Since whatsoever is the Condition of the New Covenant, must needs be the Condition of our Justification : For this is too evident to be justly denied, but that as Perfect Obedience under the Law, being the Condition of that Covenant, was to have been the Condition of our justification before God, had we been able to Perform it : So, after this Reckoning, it is no less evident, in reference to Faith, Repentance,

penitance, and good Works under the Gospel also. If therefore these must be acknowledged to be the Conditions of the New Covenant, the consequence is unavoidable that they are also the Conditions, nay the very matter and ground of our acceptation before God. And so at last in stead of making the Gospel Covenant, to be a Covenant of Faith, free and absolute, we shall make it a plain Covenant of Works : For what else maketh, or wherein else consisteth the true Form or Nature of a Covenant of Works, but that Works, whether perfect or imperfect, be the Condition of it? This being that alone that renders it essentially different from the Promise of Grace, or the Gospel Covenant.

Thirdly, It is true that Believing is Obedience to the Command of Believing, that is, it is the Act or thing Commanded, and that in order to Salvation. *He that Believeth, shall be saved. He that Believeth not, shall be Damned. He that Believeth on the Son, hath Life. He that Believeth not, shall not see Life.* But then it follows not that it is the Condition of the new Covenant. A Physitian bids his Patient to trust himself with him, and he will Cure him. The Patient by trusting in him doth what is Required ; yet this is not the condition of his Cure, but the means of accepting and using the Physitians Care and kindness. We bid a poor Man hold forth his hand, and we will give him an Alms. His holding out the hand
is

is a Means to receive the Alms, and so required by us, not a Condition of our giving it, though in so doing he doth what we bid him. If one should say to a hungry Man, there is Meat, which shall be yours to live by it, if you will eat it and digest it, else not. Who will call this a Condition? Since it is the very Partaking of the Meat it self, whereby a Man makes it his own. If a Man redeem a Captive from Slavery, and lays down the Price, will any Man call his bare acceptance of Liberty, the Condition of his Ransom? True it is, that if he do not accept thereof he will never be freed; But this is not therefore the Condition of his Ransom; for that was performed by another hand. So for a Father to say to one that he bestows his Daughter upon in Marriage. Lo she is your Wife, take her and Marry her. This is not a Condition of her being his Wife, as external to it, but it is that very intrinsecal and essential Act whereby she becomes his, and he her Husband. Additional unto all which, it ought to be duely observed, that in all those foregoing instances, there is to be supposed a Power, or capacity in the Poor, Sick, or Hungry Man, to receive the Alms, make use of the Food, or accept of the Physicians kindness, and so in the rest: But so there is not in us to believe, being by nature Dead in Trespases and in Sins; and therefore utterly uncapable to perform this supposed Condition, unless the Power and

and Vertue of the New Covenant, Mercy be first set at Work to accomplish it in us. From whence it is manifest that the New Covenant is wholly free and absolute ; Since Faith it self is the Fruit, and therefore cannot be the Condition thereof.

As for that Scripture, *Mark. 11. 26.* But if ye forgive not Men their Trespases against you, neither will your Heavenly Father forgive you with many other Scriptures that seem to require Repentance and good Works, as the Conditions of Life and Salvation.

To this I Answer, That it is true, that the immediate causes of Salvation, are those things which do prepare and dispose for the Possession of Heaven, and the state of Happiness, which is Sanctification : For this is that that makes us *meet to be Partakers of the Inheritance of the Saints in Light.* And *without Holyness no Man shall see God.* But then it doth not therefore follow that the New Covenant is a Conditional Covenant. It is the Law of the Land, and the Fathers love that Entitles an Heir to the Inheritance, Consequently these are not the Prime, but remote Causes of his actual enjoying the inheritance, when he comes of Age : But the Immediate Causes of his Possession, are his being of full Age, and being of capacity to use it these giving *Jus in Re*; the other *Jus ad Rem.* Doth it therefore follow that the full Age and capacity of the Heir, are Causes or Antecedent Conditions of his Title

to the Estate? Without these, 'tis true, if he live not, or lack understanding, he cannot Inherit the Estate, or come to the full enjoyment thereof, though never so Absolutely Purchased : But none will say they are therefore Antecedent Conditions of his Title, or Interest therein; it being plain that Life and Discretion are not Conditions of the Purchase, but Qualifications of the Subject necessary to enjoy it. Sir, you cannot be ignorant of *Bernard's* famous speech concerning good Works. *Sunt via Regni non Causa Regnandi.* They are the way to the Kingdom, not the Cause of Reigning. I know it is usual with many besides your self to call them Conditions of Life : But *Dr. Ames* gives a Distinction, which might fairly end all this Controversy. To require Conditions, saith he, as the Causes of our Right to Life is proper to the Law : But to require them as Concomitants or Effects of what God hath Promised, and the Actual Bestowing it, is agreeable to the most mild Kingdom of Grace.

If it be said God cannot forgive Sin, till Man resolves to leave it, and so Repentance must be before forgiveness.

I Answer, this is untrue, as is evident in Infants, And as for the Adult; It is true God cannot Pardon Sin, and suffer Men to go on in Sin; but it is sufficient that he Pardoneth, and together with Forgiveness, he giveth a Heart to Repent and obey. And Faith it self
which

which apprehendeth Pardon, doth implicitly contain Repentance and all other Graces: Forasmuch as unfeigned flying to and Truſting in the Mercy of God for Pardon and Eternal Life, is a turning of the Heart to God and Spiritual things, and doth naturally diſpoſe the Heart to uſe all the Means which God hath Preſcribed for the Obtaining of his Kingdom.

The ſame Answer is to be given to thoſe Scriptures that require Men to Forgive their Enemies, and if they do not Forgive, neither ſhall they be Forgiven. For,

First, This doth at the moſt but ſhew that Chriſtians muſt be Merciful, and diſpoſed to Forgive, as they expect Mercy and Forgiveness from God : But it proveth not that a Man is not Forgiven, or Juſtified, till he doth actually Forgive all Enemies, at leaſt in Purpoſe, much-leſs that it is a Condition of his being Reconciled to God. For,

Secondly, The Scripture ſuppoſeth a Man to be firſt Forgiven, and maketh that an Argument to incline him to Forgive others, *Eph. 4. 32. Forgive one another, even as God for Chriſt's ſake forgave you.* And this is the Scope of that Parable, *Mat. 18. 23, 24. &c.* The Servant is himſelf firſt Forgiven; and therefore it was judged meet that he ſhould Forgive his Fellow Servant, *verſ. 32, 33.*

Thus much by way of Answer to your firſt Argument whereby you pretend to have proved

proved the Conditionality of the New Covenant, your second follows;

Argum. 2. If God's Covenant with *Abraham*, *Gen. 12. 2, 3.* and that *Gen. 17. 2, 3.* were, as you say, pure Gospel Covenants of Grace, and yet in both some things are required as Duties on *Abraham's* part to make him Partaker of the Benefits of the Promises; then the Covenant of Grace is not Absolute but Conditional: But so it was in both these Covenants, *Ergo*,

Reply. This Argument I have already dispatched in my Answer to your third Argument upon the former Head in reference to the Covenant of Circumcision: And therefore I need say nothing to it here. I shall accordingly proceed to your third Argument, whereby you labour to prove the Conditionality of the new Covenant, which runs thus.

Printed Reply, pag. 69.

Argum. 3. If all the Promises of the Gospel be Absolute and Unconditional, requiring no Restipulation from Man, then they cannot properly and truly belong to the New Covenant. But they do properly and truly belong to the New Covenant; Therefore they are not all Absolute and Unconditional.

Reply. That the New Covenant is wholly Free and Absolute, I have already Proved by way of Answer to your foregoing Argument; there being no Condition at all Annexed thereunto, neither in *Jeremy*; nor in the Apostles
Recital

Recital thereof, *Heb.* 8. In respect whereof your present Argument might more justly and truly have been thus formed.

If all the Promises of the Gospel do properly and truly belong to the New Covenant, then they must needs be absolute and unconditional, as that was. But they properly and truly belong to the New Covenant; therefore they are all absolute and unconditional as that was.

“ The sequel of the Major, say you, is only liable to doubt or denial; namely, That “ the absoluteness of all the Promises of the “ *New Testament*, cuts off their relation to a “ Covenant. You should have said, That the Absoluteness of all the Promises of the Gospel cuts off their relation to the *New Covenant*; according to the scope of your fore-mentioned Argument, if you had kept close to that. And then you must have examined the New Covenant, and have compared the Promises of the Gospel therewith: But you knew well enough, that there are no Conditions annexed to the New Covenant, whether in *Jer.* 31. or in *Heb.* 8. the consideration whereof, it may be, startled you off, (when you came to prove the Sequel of your Major) from that expression of the New Covenant, to their relation to a Covenant in general; “ That the absoluteness of all the “ Promises in the *New Testament* cuts off their “ relation to a Covenant. (This, by the way,

way, looks with no good Countenance, and is indeed no other than a plain Shuffle: But to proceed) “ And that it doth so, say you, no Man can deny that understands the difference betwixt a Covenant and an Absolute Promise. A Covenant is a mutual Compact, or Agreement, betwixt Parties, in which they bind each other to the performance of what they Respectively promise: So that there can be no proper Covenant where there is not a Restipulation, or Re-obligation on one part, as well as a Promise on the other: But an absolute Promise binds onely one Party, and leaves the other wholly free, and un-obliged to any thing, in order to the enjoyment of the Good promised. So then, if all the *New Testament* Promises be Unconditional, and Absolute, they are not part of a Covenant, nor must that word be applied to them, they are Absolute Promises, binding no Man to whom they are made, to any Duty, in order to the enjoyment of the Mercies promised: But those Persons that are under these Absolute Promises, must and shall enjoy the Mercies of Pardon and Salvation, whether they Repent, or Repent not; Believe, or Believe not; Obey, or Obey not.

Reply. You might have added; Although God hath therein promised, to put his Laws in our Hearts, and his Fear in our inward parts;

parts; and, that as he will not depart from us; So neither shall we depart from him. But that this would have marred and overthrown all your foregoing Discourse: For these are the Promises of the New Covenant, as well as the Mercies of Pardon and Salvation. Nay, therefore God hath promised to put his Laws in our Hearts, and to write them in our Minds; because he will freely pardon our Sins. Now if our Sins are freely pardoned; and if in the self same Covenant, God hath also freely promised to write his Laws in our Minds, and put them into our Hearts, that we might thereby be made meet for himself, and the enjoyment of himself in Glory: Where lies the ground of your Inference; thrt those persons that are under those absolute Promises, must and shall enjoy the Mercies of Pardon and Salvation, whether they Repent, or Repent not; Believe, or Believe not; Obey, or Obey not? May you take to your self a liberty, think you, to say what you please, right or wrong, so you may render odious the Principles of such a Dissent from you? Will you make the Promises of God to be of none effect? Hath he spoken it, and will he not perform it? Or will he alter the thing that is gone out of his Lips, that he will write his Laws in the Hearts of those whose Sins he pardoneth?

But,

But, say you, the Absolute-
ness of the Promises cuts off
their relation to a Covenant.

Printed Reply.
P. 69, 70.

And this no Man can deny that understands
the difference betwixt a Covenant and an Ab-
solute Promise.

Reply. Sir, to this Opinion of yours, I shall
only oppose the Judgment of that Accute and
Learned Divine, whom I know you greatly
Respect and Reverence, the late worthy Dr.
Owen, in his Third Volume upon the Epistle
to the *Hebrews*, p. 267, 268. The words he
insisteth on, are these, *Heb. 8. 10. For this*
is the Covenant that I will make with the House
of Israel after those days, saith the Lord, I will
give my Laws into their Mind, and write them
upon their Hearts. And I will be to them a God,
and they shall be to me a People. The thing pro-
mised in the Prophet, saith the Dr. is a Co-
venant. — We render the words כְּרִית
and διαθήκη, in this place *by a Covenant*;
though afterward the same word is transla-
ted *by a Testament*. A Covenant properly, is
a Compact or Agreement on certain terms
mutually stipulated by two or more Parties.
As Promises are the Foundation and Rise of
it, as it is between God and Man; so it com-
priseth also Precepts, or Laws of Obedience,
which are prescribed unto Man on his part to
be observed. But in the Description of the
Covenant here annexed, there is no mention
of any Condition on the part of Man, or a-
ny

ny terms of Obedience which are prescribed unto him; but the whole consists in free gratuitous Promises, as we shall see in the Explication of it.

First, The Word *Berith* used by the Prophet, doth not only signifie a Covenant, or Compact, properly so called; but a Free, Gratuitous Promise also: Yea sometimes it is used for such a Free Purpose of God with respect unto other things, which in their own Nature are incapable of being obliged by any Moral Condition. Such is God's Covenant with Day and Night, *Jer. 33. 20, 25*. And so he says, that he made his Covenant not to Destroy the World by Water any more, *with every living Creature, Gen. 9. 10, 11*. Nothing therefore can be Argued for the Necessity of Conditions to belong unto this Covenant from the Name or Term whereby it is expressed in the Prophet. A Covenant properly is *stipulatio*. But there is no Word in the whole *Hebrew* Language of that Precise Signification.

The making of this Covenant is declared by *ברית*. But yet neither doth this require a mutual stipulation, upon Terms and Conditions, prescribed unto an entrance into Covenant: For it refers unto the Sacrifices wherewith Covenants were confirmed; and it is applied unto a meer Gratuitous Promise. *Gen. 15. 18. In that Day did God make a Covenant with Abraham, saying, unto thy Seed will*

I give this Land. As unto the Word *דאבאן*, it signifies a Covenant improperly. Properly it is a Testamentary Disposition; and this may be without any Conditions on the part of them unto whom any thing is Bequeathed. Thus far the Doctor.

“ Now, say you, to what Licentiousness
 “ this Doctrin leads Men, is Obvious to every
 “ Eye, yet this Absoluteness of the Cove-
 “ nant, as you improperly call it, is by you
 “ Asserted, &c.

In reference whereunto, I shall only mind you of one Passage more of the same Worthy Person, in his forementioned Discourse upon the *Hebrews*, P. 15. It cannot be denied, saith he, but that some Men may, and it is justly to be feared, that some Men do abuse the Doctrin of the Gospel, to Countenance themselves in a vain expectation of Mercy and Pardon, whilst they willingly live in a course of Sin: But as this in their management is the principal means of their Ruin: So in the Righteous Judgment of God, it will be the greatest Aggravation of their Condemnation. And whereas some have charged the Preachers of Gospel Grace, as those who thereby give Countenance unto this Presumption: It is an Accusation that hath more of the Hatred of Grace in it, than of the Love of Holiness: For none do or can press the Relinquishment of Sin, and Repentance of it, upon such Assured Grounds,
 and

and with such Cogent Arguments, as those by whom the Grace of Jesus Christ in the Gospel is fully opened and declared.

I shall need to say no more upon this Head, and shall therefore proceed to your Fourth Argument, which I find thus stated,

Argum. 4. If all the Promises of the New Covenant be Absolute and Unconditional, having no respect nor relation to any Grace wrought in us, nor Duty done by us ; then the Trial of our Interest in Christ by Marks and Signs of Grace is not our Duty, nor can we take Comfort in Sanctification, as an Evidence of Justification. But it is a Christian's Duty to try his Interest in Christ by Marks and Signs, and he may take Comfort in Sanctification, as an Evidence of Justification. *Ergo,*

Reply, After this rate you may Prove *Quidlibet a Quolibet* : For doth it follow, that because the New Covenant is Absolute, therefore it hath no respect nor relation to any Grace wrought in us, nor Duty done by us ? Or doth it follow, that because we may justly take comfort in Sanctification, as an Evidence of Justification, that therefore the New Covenant is Conditional : Pray Sir, make it out, For as yet you have not, how this conclusion is naturally deducible from such Premises : May not the Grace of God in the New Covenant be wholly Free and Absolute, as it is from the very Foundation to the Topstone

stone thereof, when yet we may justly take comfort in those Gracious Operations of the Spirit in us, which are brought forth as the Fruit of the Divine Grace so revealed unto us, and that as an Evidence of our Interest in him ?

As for the *Antinomian* Slurs which upon this occasion you are pleased so liberally to reflect upon me, in the following part of your Discourse upon this Head, I must tell you, that I know none that deserve that Character, but such as refuse to come under the sweet and easie Yoak of Christ ; renouncing their Duty to God in Obedience to Christ's Authority. But as for such as profess, that they are *not without Law to God, but under the Law to Christ*, as *Paul* did, and accordingly make it their business to walk Holily and Unblameably in Obedience to all God's Commands, it must needs proceed from Satan's Influence, for any of their Brethren to Slur them as *Antinomians*. But the comfort is, it is not their Lot alone : The Blessed Apostle *Paul* himself was so stigmatized, by those he had then to do with, as evidently appears from *Rom. 3. 8, 31. & 6. 1, 2*. And if he was so reproached, no wonder if the Followers of him, and of Christ, in respect of that truly Evangelical Doctrin by them Preached, be so served also.

I come now to your Fifth and Last Argument, whereby you pretend to prove the

Conditionality of the New Covenant, which I find thus formed, *Primaud Reply*, P. 78.

Arg. 5. If the Covenant of Grace be altogether Absolute and Unconditional, requiring nothing to be done on our part, to Entitle us to its Benefits; then it cannot be Man's Duty in entering Covenant with God, to deliberate the Terms, count the Cost, or give his Consent by Word, or Writing, explicitly to the Terms of this Covenant. But it is Man's Duty, in entering Covenant with God, to deliberate the Terms, and count the Cost, *Luke* 14. 26, to 34. and explicitly to give his Consent thereto, either by Word, or Writing. *Ergo*,

Reply, Sir, By way of Answer hereunto, I must tell you, that the Scriptures do make a plain distinction betwixt that New and Everlasting Covenant which God hath been pleased to make with Sinners in Jesus Christ, whereof we have been all this while discoursing, which is the sole Foundation of all our Hopes and Blessedness; and the return of that sincere and dutiful Obedience, which he requireth of us, by way of Answer thereunto. 'Tis true, there are many things which though Promised in the Covenant, and wrought in us by the Grace of God, are yet Duties Indispensibly required of us, in order to the Participation or Enjoyment of the full end of the Covenant in Glory. And in respect hereof we are indeed to deliberate the

the Terms, to sit down and count the Cost, and to give up our selves solemnly to him with sincere Resolutions and Promises of all Faithful Obedience, to the end of our Lives. For hereunto the Scriptures by you alledged, and many more, do oblige us. But then I thought you had understood, that there is a vast difference betwixt God's Covenant with us, and our Covenant with God: If not, the Scriptures will inform you.

And in this respect, in the first place, I beseech you to cast your Eye upon what God speaks to Israel of old, Ezek. 16. 59, 60, 61. *For thus saith the Lord God, I will even deal with thee as thou hast done, which hast despised the Oath in breaking the Covenant, (which must of necessity be understood of the Sinai Covenant,) nevertheless, I will remember my Covenant with thee in the Days of thy Youth. And I will Establish unto thee an Everlasting Covenant. Then shalt thou remember thy ways, and be ashamed, when thou shalt receive thy Sisters, thine Elder, and thy Younger, and I will give them unto thee for Daughters; but not by thy Covenant. And I will Establish my Covenant with thee, and thou shalt know that I am the Lord.* Here you see is a plain notice given us of a twofold Covenant betwixt God and them; the one properly theirs, the other Gods; the one a Covenant that might be broken, as it was, the other that which should endure for ever; the one respecting their Duty to God, the other

God's Promise to them. And this is the Covenant, saith God, that I will Establish.

If this do not sufficiently Instruct you in this Important Point, I beseech you look into the 89 Psalm, and there you shall find it fully cleared up, *Vers. 30. If his Children forsake my Law, and walk not in my Judgments; if they break my Statutes, and keep not my Commandments; then will I visit their Transgression with the Rod, and their Iniquity with Stripes: Nevertheless my Loving Kindness will I not utterly take from him; nor suffer my Faithfulness to fail. My Covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my Lips.* Where we find a plain distinction made betwixt God's Covenant with them, and their Duty to God. My Covenant, saith God, will I not break, though you fail in your Duty to me.

Alas Sir! Is it not Obvious to our most constant Experience, that both you and I, and all of us, (the more is our Misery,) do every Day more or less, break our own Vows, Covenants, and Resolutions, by our Daily Transgressions? And what shall relieve us under the guilt of such Daily Covenant Breaches? But that which the Lord himself directs us to. Though it be thus and thus with you, saith he, though you forsake my Law, and walk not in my Judgments, though you break my Statutes, and keep not my Commandments; yet *My Covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is*
gone

gone out of my Lips. It shall be Established for ever as the Moon, and as a Faithful Witness in Heaven.

And indeed this was that alone, which the Sweet Singer of *Israel* himself found Relief in at last, when he drew near unto his last Moments. We know, that in many places of the *Psalms*, he doth frequently Appeal unto God concerning his Integrity, and the cleanness of his Heart and Hands; his Vows, Resolutions, and Performances: But what were the last Words of the Son of *Jesse*? Or what does he take Comfort in, when he comes to the winding up of his Days? Doth he insist upon his own Covenant Engagements, and the Faithfulness of their Performance? Not at all. What then? *Although my House be not so with God; yet he hath made with me an Everlasting Covenant, ordered in all things, and sure: For this is all my Salvation, and all my Desire, although he make it not to grow, 2 Sam. 23. 5.*

Sir, I must tell you, that the want of a due Observation of this plain Scripture distinction betwixt God's Free and Absolute Covenant which he hath been pleased to make with Sinners in Jesus Christ, which as I have told you, is the Foundation of all our Blessedness. And our Covenants with God, by way of return thereunto; is the true reason of all your Mistakes about the true Nature of the Gospel Covenant, while you Jumble

and confound together, that which the Scriptures do so plainly distinguish. 'Tis true, there are many things to be Observed on our part, and many Duties to be Performed : But we cannot say, that our Hearts, or Houses, our Lives, or Ways, are so with God as they ought to have been. Were there not therefore a Free, Absolute, and Everlasting Covenant that God hath made with us in Jesus Christ; a well ordered, sure, and unchangeable Covenant, which cannot be broken, wherein is contained all our Salvation, our Hopes, and Expectations, in reference to all our own Covenants, would soon fail us, and expose us to the greatest of Disappointments at last.

Thus I have at length gone through your Discourse concerning the Covenants. And in particular, I have shewn you, that the Covenant of Circumcision which God made with *Abraham*, Gen. 17. 7. which you tell me, is the Foundation on which our Divines have built the Right of Infant's Baptism; was so far from being a Gospel Covenant, reaching *Gentile* Believers, and their Seed; that it could be no other than a Covenant of Works, as that at *Sinai* was, which was built thereon; and consequently both now Repealed. From hence therefore, as I have already told you, it unavoidably follows, that all the Arguments for the Support of Infant's Church-Membership, and Baptism, under

under the Gospel, which are founded upon the like Priviledges granted unto the Natural Posterity of *Abraham* under the former Administration, do of themselves fall to the ground, forasmuch as the Covenants themselves which those Priviledges were then Bottomed on, are now Repealed. Neither is there any room left for any other Argument to infer the Baptism of Infants, the Obligation upon Believers concerning the Gospel Sign, being wholly left unto the time of its Institution, which Determines both the Duties and Subjects thereof, to the Exclusion of Infants; as I have already Proved. Your Foundation therefore being destroyed, you might have saved your labour, in the following Part of your Present *Reply*; as I shall do mine by way of Return thereunto, except further occasion be offered; and then the Impertinency, as well as Fallacy, of your present Reasonings may be yet further detected. The substance of what you now offer having been already sufficiently Answered, had you been pleased to take notice of it in the same Discourse you pretend to Answer.

The End of the First Part.

under the Gospel, which are founded upon
the fact of the knowledge of the Gospel
Potency of the law under the former
institution, do of themselves fall to the
ground, notwithstanding as the Covenant then
gives which those Privileges were then
grounded on, the new Revelation. The
former law room for any other law
inherent to right and Justice of Justice, and
obligation upon believers concerning the
Gospel sign, being wholly left unto the time
of its institution, when I determine both the
law and the Gospel, to the Church
of Israel; and have already proved, I am
in this case, that the law being destroyed, you
might have saved your labour, in the follow-
ing Part of your Excellent Reply, as I should
have by way of Return thereunto, except
further occasion be offered; and that the
law, as well as Fallacy, of your
former Reasoning may be yet further
refuted. The substance of what you now ex-
pose, having been already satisfactorily answer-
ed, had you been pleased to take notice of it
in the same Discourse, you pretend to an-
swer.

The End of the First Part.

G 4 P A R T

P A R T I I.

Containing, a *Reply* to Mr. *Joseph Whiston's Reflections* on my fore-mentioned Discourse, in a late small Tract of his, Entituled, *The right Method for the proving Infant Baptism*. As also, a *Reply* to the several *Propositions* and *Arguments* by him insisted on, in his *Answer* to Mr. *Cox*, whereby he pretends to have clearly and fully proved, That the *Covenant of Circumcision*, established with *Abraham*, *Gen. 17. 7.* is the *Covenant of Grace*.

IN the first place then, As to what concerns Mr. *Whiston's Reflections* on my forementioned Discourse, in his late forementioned Tract: After he had dealt with Mr. *Grantbam*, he thus bespeaks the World.

Right Method.
P. 22.

I thought (saith he) I might justly expect something extraordinary in Mr. *Cary's* Book, being recommended as it is; and I shall not deny but my Expectations were somewhat high: But if ever that Proverb *Parturiunt Montes*, were verified, it is here. Alas! what do I meet with but *Ridiculus Mus*? For I have yet observed but two Arguments Syllogistically framed, by which he attempts the Confirmation of that Notion of his, That the Covenant, *Gen. 17. 7.* is not the Covenant of Grace, and the very Recital of them may in the Judgment of all unbiassed Persons be a sufficient Confutation of them.

Thus Mr. *Whiston* begins; but how he makes good these Taunting Florishes, and Scornful Reflections will appear in the Sequel. In the mean season, I do acknowledge, that there are but two Arguments Syllogistically framed in my forementioned Discourse, by which I attempted the proof of the forementioned Proposition; to wit, That the Covenant, *Gen. 17. 7.* is not the Covenant of Grace, though the Intelligent Reader may easily perceive, that I could soon have dress'd up many more in the same form, out of the Substance of my Discourse upon that Subject, and should so have done, but that I thought plain Reasonings from the Scriptures had been sufficient. However, since nothing will be taken notice of that is Argumentative in
my

my Discourse, but what is dress'd up in Mood and Figure, let us attend to what he saith to these two. My first Argument is this;

If the Covenant of Circumcision, Recorded, *Gen. 17. 7, 8, 9, 10.* was as much a Covenant of Works as that at Mount Sinai, and that mentioned, *Deut. 29. 9.* nay, as much as the Covenant made with *Adam* before his Fall; then it is not a Covenant of Grace: But it was as much a Covenant of Works as either of the Covenants before mentioned were. Therefore, &c.

Letting pass Mr. *Whiston's* scornful Reflection on this as a lusty Argument, if it would stand. Let us try the strength of it by the opposition he hath made thereunto.

In the first place then, Mr. *Whiston* hath thought fit positively to deny the Minor Proposition, as that concerns the Covenant made with *Adam* and that entred with the People of *Israel* at Mount Sinai. "Mr. *Cary* (saith he) attempts to prove his Minor thus; It must needs be as much a Covenant of Works as that entred with the People of *Israel* at Mount Sinai; Yea, as that made with *Adam* in Innocency; because, although God promised to be a God to *Abram* and to his Seed, yet it was upon Condition of Obedience, with an Answerable Threatning. But (saith he) can Mr. *Cary*, or any other Man of Common Sense, think that the bare requiring of Obedience in any Covenant,

“Covenant, or threatening of Judgments in
 “case of Disobedience, makes it presently a
 “Covenant of Works? Well, suppose it do
 “not, what then? Not to waste time (saith
 “he) Mr. *Cary* must know, that it is not the
 “bare requiring of Obedience, nor yet the
 “denouncing Threatnings, that makes a
 “Covenant a Covenant of Works; but the
 “Commanding a Perfect Sinless Obedience
 “to all that is written therein, and threat-
 “ning Death unto all, in case of the least
 “failure in such an Obedience.

Well then (say I) If this be that that truly
 denominates a Covenant to be a Covenant of
 Works: Doth not Mr. *Whiston* know that thus
 stood the Case in respect of *Adam's* Covenant;
 yea, that thus stood the Case in respect of the
Sinai Covenant, when God pronounceth a
 Curse upon every one that continued not in
 all things that are written therein to do them;
 which I did upon this occasion expressly prove
 from *Gal. 3. 10, 12*? And did I not also, up-
 on this very occasion, and in the self-same
 place, expressly prove, that this was the ve-
 ry nature of the Covenant of Circumcision,
 from *Gal. 5. 3. For I testify to every Man that is*
Circumcised, that he is a Debtor to do the whole
Law? And did I not observe from thence,
 that it is evident, that Circumcision indispen-
 sably obliged all that were under it, to a Per-
 fect Universal Obedience to the whole Re-
 vealed Will and Law of God? And did I not
 also

also evpresly prove unto you, that the breach of this Covenant was attended with an Answerable Threatning, from Gen. 17. 14. *The uncircumcised Man-child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not Circumcised, that Soul shall be cut off from his People, he hath broken my Covenant.* And what would Mr. *Whiston* have more, according to his own Concession, to prove a Covenant to be a Covenant of Works, or that the Covenant of Circumcision was indeed such a Covenant as I have affirmed it to be; to wit, no other than a Covenant of Works?

I know very well, that Mr. *Whiston* endeavours to shift off the force of Gal. 5. 3. concerning the Obligation on all that were Circumcised to do the whole Law; in his Answer to one of Mr. *Grantbam's* Arguments, by telling us, "That the Law was mis-interpreted, and mis-understood by the *Jews*, as though it had been a Law, through their meer keeping of which, they should be saved, without the Mediation of Christ: But (saith he) Circumcision never bound any Man so to keep the Law. No! say I, doth not *Moses* himself describe the Righteousness of the Law, unto which Circumcision was Annexed, after this very sort; *That the Man that doth these things shall live by them*; and that in a way of plain Contradiction, or Opposition to the *Righteousness of Faith*, which was to believe in Christ unto Life and Salvation? Rom. 10. 5, 6, &c. Yea, doth not God himself declare

clare unto the *Jews*, the Nature of the Law to be such, *Lev. 18. 5. Ye shall therefore keep my Judgments and my Statutes, which if a Man do, he shall live in them?* So that the *Jews* were right enough in their Notion concerning the Law, in reference to the true Nature of it, as it required perfect sinless Obedience in order to Life, promising Life thereon, if they could perform it, pronouncing a Curse upon the least Disobedience: For *Paul* doth plainly acknowledg it to be such, *Gal. 3. 10, 12.* And God himself by the Mouth of his Servant *Moses*, as plainly expresseth it so to be in the very first Sanction of it, *Lev. 18. 5. Deut. 27. 26.* which could not be because the *Jews* had Mis-interpreted it: For how could they Mis-interpret it before it had a Being, or before it was Instituted? 'Tis evident therefore, that such was the nature of that Covenant in it self considered, when it was first promulged: And 'tis as plain, that such was the true nature of the Covenant of Circumcision also: For can it be rationally imagined, that when the Apostle expresseth himself with that vehemence as he doth, *Gal. 5. 2, 3. For I testify again to every Man that is Circumcised, that he is a Debtor to do the whole Law.* That he thus expresseth himself, only to shew the Sence of the Jewish Teachers, or the Opinion that they had concerning the Nature of Circumcision? It is plain, that he expresseth it as his own Sence, in reference to the true nature of that

that Covenant: From whence therefore the Conclusion is evident, that it could be no other than a Covenant of Works, as that at *Sinai* was.

Proceed we then to the second Argument, which Mr. *Whiston* saith is of a like validity with the first; And if so Pag. 24.
(say I) we need desire no more:

For Mr. *Whiston* himself, according to his own forementioned Concession, unless he will shut his Eyes, must needs allow the validity of the first. My 2. Argument then as he states it is this.

That Covenant in which Faith was not reckoned to *Abraham* for righteousness, could never be a Covenant of Faith.

Here Mr. *Whiston* stops, without reciting my minor Proposition at all, first or last, nor the Proof supporting it; Contenting himself onely to give some dark and general glances at it. The Argument then as I stated it runs thus;

That Covenant in which Faith was not reckoned to *Abraham* for righteousness, could never be a Covenant of Faith: But the Scripture is exprefs, that Faith was not reckoned to *Abraham* for righteousness, when he was in Circumcision, but in uncircumcision therefore the Covenant of Circumcision could never be a Covenant of Faith.

The minor Proposition carries with it its own evidence, containing onely the words of the Text, to which it referres, *Rom. 4. 9, 10.*

Now what doth Mr. *Whiston* reply in the dark, without once mentioning what it is that he

he gives Answer to? " Strange Confidence!
 " (saith he) for Mr. Cary to take this to be an
 " Irresistible Argument! Not to spend time
 " (saith he) in shewing the Insufficiency of
 " his Proof, that speaking of Circumcision,
 " when his Argument speaks of the Covenant;
 " and sure there is a wide difference between
 " the Covenant, and Circumcision the token
 of it. But Sir, If this be all you have to say
 by way of opposition thereunto, for ought I
 can yet see, it may prove as lusty an Argu-
 ment as its fellow, which together with this,
 you have drawn forth to try your strength
 and valour upon. " His Proof (say you)
 " speaks of Circumcision, when his Argu-
 " ment speaks of the Covenant; and sure
 " there is a wide difference between the Co-
 " venant and Circumcision the token of it.
 But Sir, do you not know that in the 17th.
Gen. 9. God said unto Abraham : Thou shalt
keep my Covenant therefore, Thou and thy Seed af-
ter thee in their Generations, which himself is
 pleased to explain, *vers. 10. This is my Cove-*
nant which ye shall keep; every Man child among
you shall be Circumcised? And how dare you
 then to say, that sure there is a Wide difference
 between the Covenant and Circumcision
 the Token of it? I know very well that those
 words; *This is my Covenant :* is as much as to
 say, *This is the Sign or Token of my Covenant :*
 And so it is afterward explained, *vers. 11.*
Ye shall Circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, and it
shall

shall be a Token of the Covenant betwixt me and you. But you see by this, that these two phrases; *My Covenant*, and the *Token* thereof; are in God's account, Convertible terms; and therefore, sure, there can be no such wide difference, as you would suppose between them. Besides: Doth not *Stephen, Act. 7. 8.* Expressly call this Covenant, *the Covenant of Circumcision*; the Sign of Circumcision, being that which gives the Denomination to the Covenant it self? And is it therefore so ridiculous a thing as you would make it, when the Apostle tells us, *That Faith was not reckoned to Abraham for Righteousness, when he was in Circumcision, but in uncircumcision.* To affirm that these words must needs be understood of the *Covenant of Circumcision*? If not; what was it then, I ask you, that *Paul* there means, when he speaks of *Abraham's* being in *Circumcision*? You will tell me, it may be, that by it we are to understand his being *Circumcised*. Very good. But then I ask you again; How came he to be *Circumcised*? Or upon what account was he *Circumcised*? Sir, whatever your Answer may be, the Scripture will tell you, that he was *Circumcised* by the Command of God, and that as a *Token of the Covenant* he then made with him. and if so, no wonder if we understand the words before us, that *Faith was not reckoned to Abraham for Righteousness, when he was in Circumcision*, that is, in, or by virtue of that Covenant: For he had

had it so reckoned to him long before his Circumcision. And so the Apostle expressly tells us in the next following Words, *vers. 11. He received the Sign of Circumcision a Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised.*

And indeed, as I have already proved at large in my former Discourse, the whole foregoing and following passages of this 4th. to the *Romans*, do strongly confirm this Interpretation: Where it is plain, that the Apostles whole drift is to prove, that *Abraham* was not justified by Works; no not by his Circumcision, which was a main part thereof, but by Faith onely. And therefore, as he lets us know, that Faith was not reckoned to him for Righteousness when he was in Circumcision, but in uncircumcision, *vers. 9, 10.* So he doth upon the same account further assure us, *vers. 13.* That *the Promise that he should be the heir of the World,* (the same in effect with his being the Father of all them that believe) *was not to him, or to his Seed through the Law* (which I have already proved must of necessity be understood of the Law of Circumcision) *but through the Righteousness of Faith.* From whence I drew another Argument to the same purpose with the former: Which being not in Mood and Figure, as the others were, you seem scornfully to pass by as not worth regarding. And therefore since nothing else will please you, I will now present it to you in the following dress. That

Cir- That which is contradistinguished, or opposed unto the Righteousness of Faith, could never be a Covenant of Faith : But the Law or Covenant of Circumcision, is by the Apostle plainly opposed, or contradistinguished unto the Righteousness of Faith. Therefore the Covenant of Circumcision could never be a Covenant of Faith.

The Minor I prove from the words before us, *Rom. 4. 13.* compared with the foregoing passages of that chapter. If it be objected, that the Apostle onely speaks *vers. 13.* of the Law in general, to which the Righteousness of Faith, is there opposed, and doth not speak of the Covenant of Circumcision, let them but consider that the Law he there speaks of, and which he doth so manifestly contradict distinguish or oppose unto the Righteousness of Faith, cannot be chiefly understood concerning the Law given by *Moses*, 400 Years after *Abraham's* time, (though it was of the same nature with the Law of Circumcision, and was indeed built thereon) but it must of necessity be understood concerning the Covenant of Circumcision which God made with *Abraham* himself, which was extant in his own time. And that this is the Law, which the Apostle here intends, will evidently appear, if we duely attend unto the Scope of the Apostle, in the foregoing part of this 4th. chapter to the *Romans*; Which was to shew that *Abraham* himself was not justified by Works; no
not

not by his Circumcision, but by Faith, which he had long before he was Circumcised. For thus he begins, *vers. 1, 2. What shall we say then that Abraham our Father, as pertaining to the flesh hath found? For if Abraham were justified by Works, he hath whereof to glory, but not before God: For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was Counted to him for Righteousness.* So then Abraham was not justified by Works before God, but by Faith alone. But how doth that appear? Why thus it appears, *vers. 9, 10.* Because Faith was not reckoned to him for Righteousness when he was in Circumcision, but in uncircumcision, the like he tells us, *vers. 11, 12, For (saith he, vers. 13.) the Promise that he should be the Heir of the World, was not to Abraham, or to his Seed through the Law, (which must needs therefore be understood of the Law of Circumcision) but through the Righteousness of Faith.* From whence it is manifest that the Covenant of Circumcision, was not a Covenant of Faith, since it is here so plainly contradistinguished or opposed thereunto.

If you say, that those words of the Apostle are to be understood concerning Moses his Law; it still comes to the same reckoning at last. For then it will follow that Moses his Law was not a Covenant of Faith; And if Moses his Law was not, then neither could the Covenant of Circumcision be such: For as it is evident that the one was built on the other;

other; So it is as manifest, that they were both of the same nature.

But before we part, as to this, you have one Question to ask me; And that is; "Whether Faith was reckoned Pag. 25.
"to *Abraham* for Righteousness, by
"a meer Act of Sovereign Grace, without
"respect had to any Covenant he was then
"under? Or was it reckoned to him by ver-
"tue of some Promise, or any Covenant he
"was then under? If he say the latter (say
"you) then you shall affirm, that was the
"the Covenant of Grace. And who doubts
of that (say I?) For my own part I do not
question it; But yet this I must tell you by the
way that what you here affirm, you do as
positively deny in the 95 pag. of your Answer
to Mr. Cox. For there you say that in those
Transactions of God with *Abraham* mentioned,
Gen. 12. 2, 3. He did not make or establish
the Covenant of Grace with him. The truth
is (say you there) He did not then make
any Covenant at all with him, and conse-
quently not the Covenant of Grace. On the
"contrary, here you affirm that it was the
"Covenant of Grace, the same for substance
"with this now entred with him, onely be-
"fore less compleat, but now fully com-
pleated. (That is, when the Covenant of
Circumcision was made with him.) But who
told you so (say I) that it was the same Co-
venant for Substance with this now entred
with

with him? When 'tis evident that the former was absolute (as your self cannot but grant in your Answer to Mr. Cox) this conditional. And is an absolute and a conditional Covenant, the same for Substance? I trow not. Or was the former Covenant, wherein God promised to Bless *Abraham*, and that in him should all the Nations of the Earth be Blessed, less compleat than the latter, wherein God promiseth to be a God unto him and his natural Posterity onely? But

(say you) "How the Institution
Pag. 25. "of Circumcision could either cast

"*Abraham* out of it (that is out of
"the Covenant of Grace that had been before
"made with him) or alter the tenure of the
"Covenant, so as that before he had Faith
"reckoned to him for Righteousness, by
"virtue of the same Promises contained in it,
"but after, neither had nor could have Faith
"alike reckoned to him for Righteousness,
"by virtue of the same Promises, is (say
"you) as much above the under standing of
"Man as the former.

But Sir, have you never read what the Apostle tells you, *Gal. 3. 17.* That *the Covenant that was Confirmed before of God in Christ, the Law which was 430 Years after, cannot disannul that it should make the Promise of none effect?* The like may as justly be said of the Covenant of Circumcision; It could not disannul that it should make the fore established Cove-
nant

nant of Grace to be of none effect; since the Grace of the one prevailed, and did by far supersede the force and power of the other: For so the Apostle resolves the Point, in reference to the Law, *Rom. 5. 20. The Law (saith he) entred that the Offence might abound: But where Sin hath abounded, Grace did much more abound.*

Indeed the plain Scope of the Apostle, *Rom. 4. 9, 10.* when he tells us, that *Faith was not reckoned to Abraham for Righteousness, when he was in Circumcision, but in uncircumcision;* as also of the following Words, *vers. 13.* is to shew that *Abraham's* Righteousness, whereby he was justified before God, and the Inheritance where unto he was entituled, was not derived unto him, or to his Seed through the Covenant of Circumcision: But through the channel of that free and absolute Covenant, which God had before been pleased to enter with him, *Gen. 12. 2, 3,* which the Apostle takes such special notice of *Gal. 3. 8.* And this was an Evangelical Covenant indeed, wholly free and absolute, and therefore sure and certain, unrepealable and Eternal, and that both unto *Abraham* himself, as also to all his Spiritual Seed therein concerned: Whereas the Covenant of Circumcision might be broken as it was, and the mercies therein contained, forfeited, as they were, which the other could not.

Mr. *Whiston*, begins the Tract wherein the forementioned Passages are contained, with an Acknowledgment,

ment, “ That on the part of those that have
 “ pleaded the Cause Pædobaptism, he cannot
 “ but conclude, that many mistakes they have
 “ lain under, both about the Tenour of the Co-
 “ venant, on which they have founded their
 “ Pleas for Infant-Baptism, did at the first
 “ in a great measure, give Rise to this Con-
 “ troversie. And a little after; That to him
 “ ’tis past doubt, that mistakes on the part of
 “ Pædobaptists, have greatly promoted the
 “ Cause of Antipædobaptism.

It seems then that the Pædobaptists them-
 selves are subject to Mistakes and Errours, as
 well as other Men. And ’tis to be hoped,
 that in due time they may yet further be con-
 vinc’d of their Mistakes; and in particular
 in reference to the true Nature of the Cove-
 nant of Circumcision, which they have hith-
 therto celebrated, as the great Charter, from
 whence the claim of their Infant Seed, to
 the Priviledg of Gospel Ordinances is de-
 rived.

Pag. 6. “ On the part of the Antipædo-
 “ baptists, he wishes there had been
 “ a more equal Dividend, that those among
 “ them that are Men of greater Parts and Abil-
 “ ities, had a greater share with their Brethren
 “ of lower Parts and Abilities, in their Sincere-
 “ cerity, Simplicity and Love unto Truth; and
 “ those weaker ones had a greater share with
 “ their Brethren in those Parts and Abilities
 “ they have attained to. Some (saith he) gro-
 “ seem

" seem sufficiently furnished with Abilities
 " for the finding out, at least, discerning
 " Truth when set before them, and yet by
 " one means or another comply not with it;
 " but on the other hand, do oppose it:
 " Others have sufficient Sincerity and Love to
 " Truth, to ingage them to a Compliance
 " with it when discerned, but have not such
 " Accuteness of Understanding, nor Solidity
 " of Judgment, as is necessary for the finding
 " out, or discerning a Truth, that lies at
 " all below the very Surface of the Scrip-
 " tures.

It seems then, that those weak and sincere
 Men he speaks of, that have such Love to
 Truth among the Antipædobaptists, have
 Understanding enough to discern a Truth
 that lies *upon the Surface of the Scriptures*; but if
 never so little *under it*, they cannot discern it:
 But then what will Mr. *Whiston* make of the
 Divine *Unction* which God hath promised unto
 all that truly seek unto him, whether of
 higher or lower Parts or Abilities in the
 Worlds Estimation, which was to lead them
 into the way of *All Truth*? For after this Reck-
 oning, if a Truth lies never so little below
 the Surface of the Scriptures; such as are of
 the lower Ranck cannot discern it, the *An-*
noyning notwithstanding; whilst some there
 are so Accute and Sharp-sighted, that they
 can discern and find it out, though it be a
 great deal lower; and would perswade their

H

weak

weak Brethren, that what they see upon the Surface of the Scriptures, is not Truth, but that the Truth lieth lower, and that none but such as are Men of deep Wits, and accurate Understandings can discern it. But if this be so, what shall such poor weak Souls do? Why, they must of necessity believe and follow their Guides, though against their own Understandings, and if they err, lay the blame on them that misled them. But this will be but a sad kind of Remedy; since whether casually or wilfully Blind, both must fall into the Ditch at last.

Mr. *Whiston* on the other hand, doth or might know, that the way of the Gospel is so plain, that it is to be seen upon the very Surface of the Scriptures; and that so as that *the wayfaring Man, though a Fool, shall not err therein; Isa. 35. 8. The Heart also of the Rash shall understand Knowledge, and the Tongue of the Stammerer shall be ready to speak plainly, Isa. 32. 4.* It seems then that the defect of Scholastick Learning, or Humane Litterature, Accuteness of Understanding, or fleshly Wisdom, shall not hinder such sincere Souls as have a love to Truth from finding it out, and walking in it, if God be their Instructor. Neither indeed can it be rationally imagin'd, that Jesus Christ has left his Gospel Institutions, at such a rate of Uncertainty, or Ambiguity, as to the true and proper Subjects of them, so as that none but Men of great Parts and

and Learning can find them out. In which respect Mr. Whiston ought to have considered what the Apostle tells us, 1 Cor. i. 26, 27. You see your Calling, Brethren, how that not many wise Men after the Flesh, nor many Mighty, nor many Noble, are called: But God hath chosen the foolish things of the World to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the World, to confound the things that are Mighty; and base things of the World, and things which are despised hath God chosen; yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are, that no flesh should glory in his presence.

But can Mr. Whiston justly say, as he here seems to insinuate, That those of greater Abilities; among the Antipædobaptists have not that Sincerity, Simplicity, nor love to Truth, so as to comply therewith, when 'tis discerned by them? This is a hard Censure; and what should move him to so uncharitable a Reflection, let himself judge, and think upon his own Sincerity while he was Writing of it. If they have not Sincerity, nor love to Truth, let him say, what causeth them to Buy it at so dear a rate, and with so much cost as their Reputation, and other Advantages in the World do amount unto? Or what moves them to keep it, and hold it fast, though they run the hazard of all that is near and dear unto them? Why is it that they expose themselves to all sorts of Defamations and Slanders, to

be made as the filth of the World, and as the Off-scouring of all things, as they are unto this day?

Well, Mr. *Whiston* having thus Prefac'd his Work, he proceeds in the nex place, to his *Right Method for the proving of Infants Baptism.*

In order to a full establishment of which Practice (saith he) 'tis absolutely necessary that a Foundation be laid where I have laid it, viz. in the forementioned Covenant which God made with *Abram*, *Gen.* 17. 7. And particularly, that this Foundation be surely laid: First, It must be solidly proved, that this Covenant is not the Old Covenant, which the Apostle tells is done away, but that it is the Covenant of Grace, that very Covenant under which Believers still are. This, he saith, he hath done already, in his Answer to Mr. *Cox*. Wherein he saith he hath demonstrated these Three Positions.

First, That God in those Transactions with *Abram*, Recorded, *Gen.* 12. did not make, or establish the Covenant of Grace with him; that is, He did not then compleat it. God then began to deal with *Abram* with reference to the establishing his Covenant with him; and did as it were draw the first Lines of that Covenant he intended afterward in a more formal expresse manner to enter with him.

Secondly, That the Covenant Recorded,
Gen.

Gen. 17. 7. is not the Old Covenant, nor had any Reference or Relation thereunto.

Thirdly, That that Covenant is the Covenant of Grace, the same which Believers are still under.

How Mr. *Whiston* hath performed what he here speaks of we shall see anon. In the mean season; “ Would our Opposers P. 9.
 “ (saith he) satisfy the World in their Judgments and Practices, they ought to return solid and satisfactory Answers to those Arguments, pleaded in Confirmation of each of those Positions; their silence wherein renders all their Discourses utterly insignificant in the Judgment of all Men of a competent Understanding. Alas! can they think a loose Discourse, however filled up with Scripture Quotations, can be of any use to such Persons, so long as those Arguments remain unanswered? And it seems strange to me, that Men of any Judgment, Gravity, or Conscience, should recommend to the World, any Discourses so excessively defective in that regard, in the management of the Cause they plead. It being evinced and demonstrated past all rational Contradiction, that this Covenant is not the Old Covenant, said to be done away, but the Covenant of Grace; the most copious Harangue of words, how many Scriptures soever are alledged therein, signifieth nothing, save onely to show how tenacious

“ Men are of Error; and how they will
 “ wrest and pervert the Scriptures, to con-
 “ firm themselves and others therein, when
 “ once embraced by them.

Reply. Sir, I perceive you have an over va-
 lue for those Arguments of yours, which you
 say, are not yet answered. I do assure you,
 I never saw, nor heard of them, till your
 now present Information concerning them.
 But in my Opinion, Sir, you too much un-
 dervalue the Holy Scriptures for their sakes.
 What! must the most copious Harangue of
 Words, how many Scriptures soever are al-
 ledged therein; or a Discourse however filled
 up with Scripture Quotations that speak
 plainly and distinctly to the thing designed to
 be proved thereby, be reckoned to signify no-
 thing, nor to be of any use, so long as those
 Arguments of yours remain unanswered? Sir,
 those Scriptures prove the things they are in-
 tended for; or they do not. If they do, you
 are to blame to slight them as you do, be-
 cause your Arguments are not expressly nam-
 ed; though it may be they meet with them,
 and Confute them too, in the Judgment of
 Impartial Men. If they do not prove what
 they are designed for, you ought to have gi-
 ven the World some Competent Demonstra-
 tion thereof, instead of a bare Affirmation
 that they signify nothing, save onely to shew
 how tenacious Men are of Error, and how
 they will wrest and pervert them. This is,
 indeed,

indeed, an easy way of answering Books, as
 Dextrous and as Nimble as the *Junior Sophister*
 in *Oxford* used with *Bellarmino*, when he writ
 in the end of his Books, *Bellarmino thou*
liest.

Well, but however you judge, or what-
 ever your Opinion is concerning my Scrip-
 ture Arguments, contained in the Discourse
 you now reflect upon: You now must give
 me leave, Sir, to enter the Lists with you:
 And I do now therefore solemnly advise you
 to prepare for your Defence, in reference to
 those forementioned Arguments of yours,
 as I find them contained in your Answer to
 Mr. Cox, whereby you pretend, that you
 have solidly proved, that the Covenant of
 Circumcision is not the Old Covenant, which
 the Apostle tells is done away, but that it is
 the Covenant of Grace, that very Cove-
 nant, under which Believers still are. And
 this, you tells us, you have already done, by
 Demonstrating the three forementioned Pro-
 positions.

Prop. 1. That God in those Transactions
 with *Abraham*, Recorded, *Gen. 12.* did not
 make or establish the Covenant of Grace
 with him; that is, he did not then com-
 plect it.

Reply, But Sir, can you justly Affirm, that
 God in those Covenant Transactions with
Abraham Recorded, *Gen. 12.* did not then
 make a compleat Covenant with him; If so,

what doth the Apostle mean, when he tells us as he doth, *Gal. 3. 8. That the Scripture foreseeing that God would Justifie the Heathen through Faith, Preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all Nations be Blessed?* What think you, Sir, was not this the *Gospel Covenant* which God made with *Abraham*? Was not the Gospel the Covenant, and the Covenant the Gospel? And will you call this an *Incomplete Gospel Covenant*, when it was that through the Faith of which the Heathen were to be Justified? Or will you call it *Incomplete*, when the Apostle, *Vers. 17.* speaking of the same Gospel, calls it, *The Covenant that was Confirmed before of God in Christ*: Yea, when it was also such a Covenant as was far more *Extensible*, in respect of the *Subjects* thereof, than was either the *Covenant of Circumcision*, or the *Sinai Covenant*, which was built thereon, which followed after? It is too Evident to be justly denied, but that the *Covenant of Circumcision* hath a single reference to *Abraham's* Natural Posterity chiefly: Forasmuch as all those to whom the Promises of that Covenant were made, were bound to be Circumcised, as the Sign or Token of it, which doth not concern the *Gentiles* at all; whereas the forementioned *Gospel Covenant* which God made with *Abraham*, *Gen. 12. 3.* doth plainly comprehend both *Jews* and *Gentiles*; that is, the Elect of God in all the Nations of the Earth: For,

In thee, (saith God there to Abraham,) shall all the Families of the Earth be Blessed. Now I pray Sir consider, which of the Two Covenants is the more compleat? Whether that which comprehends the Elect of God in all Nations, both Jews and Gentiles? Or that which concerned Abraham's Natural Posterity only? Will you say, that the Covenant of Circumcision, wherein God only promised to be a God to Abraham, and his Natural Seed after him, in their Generations, upon Condition, that He and His were Circumcised, and fulfilled the whole Law, was a more compleat Covenant Transaction, than the forementioned and fore-established Covenant, wherein God freely Promised to Bless him, and all Nations in him; wherein not only the Elect of his own Posterity were so deeply and dearly concerned, but those among all the Nations of the Earth besides? Or will you say, that a Covenant that might be broken, as the Covenant of Circumcision, and that at Sinai was, and the Mercies therein contained forfeited, as they were, did add any thing of Perfection to that fore-established Covenant which could never be broken? The Law, (saith the Apostle,) made nothing Perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did, by the which we draw nigh unto God, Heb. 7. 19.

You are utterly Mistaken therefore Sir, if you imagine, that the Covenant of Circum-

rision, or the Sinai Covenant which followed after, did add any *Compleatment* unto the forementioned Gospel Covenant. Indeed these were so far from adding any *Compleatment* thereunto, that the Apostle expressly affirms in the forementioned Gal. 3. 18. that *if the Inheritance be of the Law, it is no more of Promise, but,* saith he, *God gave it to Abraham by Promise.* The fear on the other side was, lest the Law, wherein the Covenant of Circumcision was comprehended, should Peradventure have had so much Power and Efficacy, as to *disannul* the forementioned Gospel Covenant, (which the Apostle carefully guards against *Vers. 17.*) rather than that there was any shadow of pretence, to affirm, that it added ought unto the *Compleatment, or Security*, thereof. *Wherefore then serveth the Law?* (saith the Apostle in the next following words,) *It was added,* saith he, *because of Transgressions, till the Seed should come to whom the Promise was made.* Mr. Flavel indeed tells me, that the Law was Published with Evangelical Purposes, as being of the same Piece and Complexion with the Promise. The Vanity of which Notion, I have already detected in my foregoing Discourse, where I have proved, that the Law was so far from adding any *Compleatment* thereunto; that it was added as an *Appendix* rather, to the *First Covenant of Works*, to reinforce *that*; the more effectually thereby to

Con-

Convince Men of their need of a Saviour, and force them to the Promise for relief.

Besides, If God in those Covenant Transactions with *Abraham*, Recorded *Gen. 12.* did not, as you say, make, or establish, the Covenant of Grace with him, that is, he did not then Compleat it, till the Covenant of Circumcision was added; then the Apostle would not have spoken as he doth, *Gal. 3. 8.* but rather thus: That the Scripture fore-seeing that God would Justifie the Heathen through Faith, Preached before the Gospel unto *Abraham*, saying, I will be a God to thee, and to thy Seed after thee, in their Generations, provided that thou and they be Circumcised, and keep the whole Law. But, as there is not a word of this Nature in all the New-Testament besides; so this would have been Contradictory to the whole of what he had said before, as well as also of what follows after. For, (saith he, *Vers. 2.*) this only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the Works of the Law, or by the Hearing of Faith? Are ye so foolish, having begun in the Spirit, are you now made Perfect by the Flesh? He therefore that Ministreth to you the Spirit, and worketh Miracles among you, doth he it by the Works of the Law, or by the Hearing of Faith? Even as *Abraham* believed God, and it was counted to him for Righteousness: Know ye therefore, that they which are of Faith, the same are the Children of *Abraham*. From whence he proceeds, *Vers. 8.* to inform

us, That the Scripture foreseeing that God would Justifie the Heathen through Faith, Preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all Nations be-Blessed. So then, (saith he,) they which be of Faith are Blessed with Faithful Abraham: For as many as are of the Works of the Law are under the Curse, &c. From all which it is Evident, that the forementioned Gospel Covenant which God made with Abraham, Gen. 12. 2, 3. was so far from being Compleated by the Law, or by the Covenant of Circumcision which was Annexed thereunto, that those Covenants rather brought them under the Curse, through their Weakness, or Disobedience, thereunto, which Christ by his Blood and Sufferings hath delivered us from.

'Tis true, the Gospel Covenant mentioned, Gen. 12. 2, 3. was afterwards further Explained and Re-inforced, Gen. 22. 18. where the Lord tells Abraham, That in his Seed should all the Nations of the Earth be Blessed. And thy Seed shall Possess the Gate of his Enemies. Plainly speaking of Christ the Promised Seed, through whom these Gospel Blessings were to be derived unto all that were the Proper Subjects of them. Before, it was only, In thee shall all Nations be Blessed. Now God plainly tells him what he then meant. In thee; that is, in thy Seed: So that the Gospel Covenant was Compleat enough before, for the Substance of it; it only needed Explanation,

planation, as to the manner how those Gospel Blessings were to be derived. The like may be Observed in reference to what God tells *Abraham*, Gen. 15. 5. So shall thy Seed be. And Gen. 17. 4, 5. As for me, behold my Covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a Father of many Nations; neither shall thy Name any more be called Abram, but thy Name shall be called Abraham: For a Father of many Nations have I made thee. All which were but further Explanations of the Gospel Covenant, which for the substance thereof, he had before Established with him; when God told him in the forementioned Gen. 12. 3. I will make of thee a great Nation, and I will Bless thee, and make thy Name Great, and thou shalt be a Blessing. And I will Bless them that Bless thee, and Curse him that Curseth thee. And in thee shall all the Families of the Earth be Blessed.

But that God in this Covenant Transaction with *Abraham*, Recorded Gen. 12. did solemnly Confirm, or Establish, his Covenant with him, Mr. *Whiston* absolutely denies, P. 95. of his *Answer to Mr. Cox*. And on the contrary affirms, that in those Transactions of God with *Abraham*, he did not then make any Covenant at all with him, and consequently not the Covenant of Grace. And he offers a Three-fold Argument to prove the Negative.

Argum. 1. Where we have neither the Name of a Covenant, nor the thing it self, there

there no Covenant, consequently not the Covenant of Grace was made: But in these Transactions of God with *Abraham*, we have neither the Name of a Covenant, nor the thing it self. Therefore, &c.

Reply, First, That it hath the Name of a Covenant, I have already proved from *Gal. 3.* where the same that the Apostle calls *the Gospel Preached unto Abraham*, *Vers. 8.* he calls *the Covenant Confirmed before of God in Christ*, *Vers. 17.* Besides, that it hath the Name of a Covenant, is Evident from *Peter's Words*, *Acts 3. 25.* *Ye are the Children of the Prophets, and of the Covenant which God made with our Fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be Blessed.* And if this Gospel Promise Recorded *Gen. 22. 17.* was a Covenant in *Peter's* account, though *Moses* calls it not so: Why not that Recorded *Gen. 12.* also, since the latter is a plain repetition of the former, the Word, *Seed*, only, being added for the further Explanation thereof? *Answer to Mr. Cox, P. 95.*

But if it have the Name, where is the thing? "Here are, 'tis true, (saith Mr. *Whiston*,) some Absolute Promises made to *Abraham*, Personally considered, but not any to his Seed, whether Natural or Spiritual, conveying unto them any particular good: Neither is there here any Restipulation required, as there is in the Covenant
" of

of Grace, as in all other Covenants, where that Term is used in a proper sense. *Reply*, Some Absolute Promises. Why, will Mr. *Whiston* deny that the Scripture anywhere gives the Denomination of a Covenant to some Absolute Promises, where no Restipulation is required? What will he then say to those before mentioned, *Gen. 22. 16, 17.* which nevertheless *Peter* expressly calls a Covenant: Nay, what will he then say to God's Covenant with *the Day and Night* mentioned, *Jer. 33. 20, 25.* where that Term is used for such a free Purpose of God, with respect unto such things, which in their own Nature are incapable of being obliged by any Moral Condition, or Restipulation? And so he says, that he made his Covenant not to destroy the World by Water any more, *with every Living Creature*, *Gen. 9. 10, 11.* It cannot therefore be justly infered, that because there is no Restipulation required, *Gen. 12.* it may not therefore be duly called a Covenant. But for Mr. *Whiston's* further Conviction herein, I shall refer him to *Gen. 15. 18.* where this Term of a Covenant is by God himself applied unto a meer Gratuitous Promise. *In that Day did God make a Covenant with Abraham; saying, unto thy Seed will I give this Land.*

By the way, I desire Mr. *Flavell* to take notice, that what he denies, his Friend Mr. *Whiston* here plainly grants, and positively asserts,

serts, viz. That the Promises mentioned, Gen. 12. 2, 3. are Absolute Promises, without any Restipulation.

But, (saith Mr. *Whiston*,) "Here are 'tis true, some Absolute Promises made to *Abraham*, Personally considered, but not any made to his Seed, whether Natural, or Spiritual, conveying to them any particular good. No! say I, what is the meaning then of that Promise, *I will make of thee a great Nation*? How could God make of *Abraham* a great Nation, but with reference to his Seed, whether Natural, or Spiritual, or both? And when God Promiseth to Bless him, and to make him a Blessing, and that in him should all the Families of the Earth be Blessed. Are there not here many particular Blessings, and those great enough, and good enough, Promised to him and them? Are they not sufficiently Blessed whom God thus Promiseth to Bless? Yea, are they not Spiritually Blessed, since we are expressly told, That the Scripture foreseeing that God would Justifie the Heathen through Faith, Preached before the Gospel unto *Abraham*; saying, in thee shall all Nations be Blessed? Was not Justification by Faith a Spiritual, as well as a Particular, Blessing to those that should be the Proper Subjects thereof?

Argum. 2. If the Covenant of Grace were at this time entered with *Abraham*, and this be

a distinct Covenant from that mentioned, *Gen. 17. 7.* then there were Two distinct Covenants of Grace entred with *Abraham*: But there were not Two distinct Covenants of Grace entred with *Abraham*. Therefore at this time the Covenant of Grace was not entred with him.

Reply, Though the Covenant mentioned, *Gen. 12. 2, 3.* was indeed a distinct Covenant from that mentioned, *Gen. 17. 7.* It doth not therefore follow, that these were *Two distinct Covenants of Grace*: For I have already proved, that they were Essentially, or Specifically, different, the one being a Covenant of Grace, the other of *Works*.

Argum. 3. The Covenant of Grace was made with *Abraham*, as Actually Constituted the Father of the Faithful: But at the time of this Transaction P. 96. of God with him, he was not Actually Constituted in that Relation. Therefore at that time the Covenant of Grace was not entred with him.

Reply, Will Mr. *Whiston* say, that because in the Renovation of the Promise, *Gen. 3. 15.* wherein the Essence of the Covenant of Grace was contained, God did oft times make other Additions to it, as unto *Abraham* and *David*, that therefore at that time the Covenant of Grace was not entred with our first Parent? Yea, was it not that which both he and all the Faithful lived upon, and were

were saved by, till *Abraham's* time, as dark and seemingly Imperfect as it was? Besides, I have before proved, that though the Gospel Covenant mentioned, *Gen. 12. 2, 3.* was afterward further Explained and Re-inforced; yet it was then, as compleat as compleat could be for the substance thereof, it only needed Explanation, as to the manner how the Gospel Blessings therein contained should be derived; which the after Repetitions of the same Gospel Covenant do more particularly and plainly declare. And in particular, as to *Abraham's* being the Father of the Faithful: Mr. *Whiston* himself cannot but confess, *P. 97.* that God did indeed intimate unto *Abraham*, *Gen. 12.* that he should be for the future Constituted in that Relation: But, saith he, he did not then Actually Constitute him in it. If so, (say I,) that is enough. God's Intimations are sufficient Constitutions, we need desire no more to Constitute a Covenant of Grace. And so much for Mr. *Whiston's* first Proposition: Proceed we then to the Examination of his Second.

Prop. 2. That that Covenant established with *Abraham* and his Seed in their Generations, *Gen. 17. 7.* is the Covenant of Grace, or that Gracious Covenant, confirmed in Christ, according unto which all the elect always have been, still are, and yet shall be saved.

Pag. 102.

This

This, he saith, he shall speak to both, Ne-
gatively and Positively.

First, Negatively; That this Covenant was
not the Old Covenant, or the same with that
entered with the People of *Israel*, at Mount
Sinai.

Argum. 1. If the Scripture continually de-
clares that the Covenant made at
Mount *Sinai*, was the Old Cove- Pag. 103.
nant, and no where declares that
this Covenant made with *Abraham* was so;
Then that Covenant made at *Sinai*, and not
this made with *Abraham* was the Old Cove-
nant: But the antecedent is true, therefore
the consequent.

Reply. Mr. *Whiston* knows well enough, that
the Covenant of Works made with our first
Parent, is generally acknowledged to be the
First or *Old Covenant*. And why is it called
the First or Old Covenant, but because it was
the first Covenant Transaction that ever
passed between God and Man? Though the
Scripture no where declares this in express
terms, or gives the appellation of a Covenant,
much less, of the First or Old Covenant, to
that Covenant Transaction. So that the Si-
lence of the Scripture, as to this express term
of the Old Covenant, in reference to the Co-
venant of Circumcision, is no just Argument
that therefore it is not So. And if no other
reason can be assigned why the *Sinai* Cove-
nant is called in Scripture, the First or Old
Covenant,

Covenant, but because of its Affinity with that made with our first Parent ; Since it was not the first Covenant that God ever made with Men, in respect of time (an expresse Covenant having been made with *Abraham*, and with *Noah* also long before) why may not the Covenant of Circumcision also pass under the Denomination of the First or Old Covenant, because of its Affinity with that at *Sinai* the same mercies being promised, and the same duties commanded, in the one that were in the other, which hath expressly the title of the First or Old Covenant given to it in the Scripture ?

Argum. 2. The Law or the Old Covenant was ordained by Angels in the hand of a humane Mediatour, a Mediatour that was a meer Man : But this Covenant established with *Abraham*, was not ordained by Angels in the hand of a Humane Mediatour. Therefore this Covenant was not the Law or the Old Covenant. Pag. 104.

Reply. By the same Rule, and for the same Reason you may as well deny that the Covenant of Works, made with our first Parent was the Old or the first Covenant, because it was not ordained by Angels in the hand of a Humane Mediatour, as the *Sinai* Covenant was.

Argum. 3. The Law or Old Covenant was given 430 Years, after the Covenant of Grace was entred with *A-* Pag. 104.
brham. But this Covenant entred

with

with *Abraham*, was not entered 430 Years after the Covenant of Grace was entered with him. Therefore this Covenant cannot be the Law, or Old Covenant. The Major (say you) is evident from, *Gal. 3. 17.* The Minor, from the History of God's Covenant transactions with *Abraham*.

Reply. Though the Covenant of Works which was given by *Moses* at Mount *Sinai*, was 430 Years after the Covenant of Grace was entered with *Abraham*, *Gen. 12.* Yet it follows not that there was therefore no other Edition thereof ever extant in the World, you your self cannot but acknowledg that it was first made with *Adam* in innocency; And if so, why there might not be another Edition thereof, besides that given at *Sinai*; Neither the Scripture by you now mentioned, nor any other says any thing to the contrary.

Argum. 4. God himself expressly denies that this Covenant established with *Abraham*, was the Old Covenant. *Pag. 105.* Therefore, &c. That God expressly denies the Covenant established with *Abraham* to be the Old Covenant, is evident, *Dent. 32. 3.* Where, saith *Moses*, speaking by the spirit of God. *The Lord our God made a Covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this Covenant with our Fathers.* Now that under this term *Fathers* we must necessarily include *Abraham* cannot be denied, whence it is evident that the Covenant made in *Horeb*, that is

is at Mount *Sinai*, was not made with *Abraham*.

Reply. Either the Covenant which *Moses* here speaks of, which God made with *Israel* in *Horeb*, that is, at Mount *Sinai*, was a Covenant of Grace, that is, a Gospel Covenant, as *Mr. Flavel*, *Mr. Roberts*, *Mr. Sedgwick*, and many others affirm it was; or a Covenant of Works. If it was a Gospel Covenant? How will you resolve the Point, when *Moses* tells you here expressly, That *the Lord made not this Covenant with our Fathers*? Will you say, or can it be imagined that God never made any Gospel Covenant with *Abraham*, *Isaac*, or *Jacob*, or the rest of the Fathers? How then were they Saved? If it was a Covenant of Works (as you seem to grant it was) the same difficulty occurs on the other hand. For can you say that God never made any Covenant of Works with *Abraham*, and the rest of the Fathers? Was there not a Covenant of Works made with our *first Father*, and in him with all his *Posterity*? Were not *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob* children of wrath by nature, as well as others, and consequently then under the First or Old Covenant? Wherefore when *Moses* says, That *the Lord made not this Covenant with our Fathers*, (speaking of the *Sinai* Covenant) it cannot be understood *Absolutely*, as if therefore they had never been under the Old Covenant, for it is plain that they had, as being of *Adam's* *Posterity*.

rity. And it is as plain that the first lines even
 of the Covenant at Mount *Sinai*, were first
 drawn in the establishment of the Covenant
 of Circumcision. There was the *first draught*
 thereof, and then God *first began* to deal with
 even *Abraham* himself, in order to the esta-
 blishment of that Covenant, he intended after-
 ward in a more formal express manner to ac-
 complish, though it was not as yet *Completed*.
 So that *Moses* might justly enough say, (speak-
 ing of the *Sinai* Covenant) *The Lord made not*
this Covenant with our Fathers, that is, in the
 same *manner* and *Circumstances*, as it is now
 made with us. The Lord never appeared
 till now with such dreadful Majesty, with
 such Thundrings, Blackness, Darkeness, and
 Tempest. God never discovered himself till
 now with the Sound of a Trumpet, and the
 Voice of Words, which voice they that heard,
 entreated that the Word should not be spoken
 to them any more. It cannot be denied but
 that God had before made the same Covenant
 of Works with them in *Adam* for the *Substance*
 thereof. And it is as plain that the *first lines*
 even of the *Sinai* Covenant it self had been
 drawn in the Covenant of Circumcision; But
 it was not then *Completed*, there were many
 Ceremonies, Statutes and Judgments to be
 added thereunto, which the Fathers knew
 nothing of. The same Covenant for the Sub-
 stance thereof had been before made with
 them ; though not in the same manner, and
 with

with such circumstances as it had been now Performed. So that this Scripture makes nothing to your purpose at all.

No more doth that which follows, when
 “ you tell us, That that which
 “ may yet further confirm us is this, *Pag. 105.*
 “ That the Lord himself expressly
 “ distinguisheth that Covenant made with
 “ *Abraham*, from that Covenant made at *Sinai*,
 “ *Deut. 29. 1. These are the Words of the Cove-*
 “ *nant which the Lord Commanded Moses to make*
 “ *with the Children of Israel in the Land of Moab,*
 “ *beside the Covenant which he made with them in*
Horeb. But how doth it appear by this, that
 the Lord himself distinguisheth the Covenant
 made with *Abraham*, from that made with
Abraham, from that made at Mount *Sinai*?
 “ Why yes (saith *Mr. Whiston*) because the
 “ Covenant here spoken of with God made
 “ with *Israel* in the Land of *Moab*, is *Abraham's*
 “ Covenant. So, saith he, it is expressly de-
 “ clared, *vers. 13.* Now this Covenant is ex-
 “ pressly declared to be another Covenant be-
 “ sides that made in *Horeb*, *vers. 1.* And
 “ therefore they could not be one and the
 “ same Covenant.

But then *Mr. Whiston* should have considered, that a Covenant may be one and the same Covenant for substance, though often repeated. And that thus stood the Case, in respect of the Three formentioned Covenants, that at *Sinai*, that in the Land of *Moab*,
 and

and that with *Abraham*, is evident. For first, if you compare *Deut. 29. vers 2, 3, 9.* with *Exod. 19. 4, 5.* you will find, that this in the Land of *Moab* exactly agrees with the *Sinai* Covenant, the Terms being exactly the same, as well as also the Promises, in both Covenants. So that the Sense of *Deut. 29. 1.* can be no other than this. These are the Words, that is, these are the Terms, or Conditions, upon which God hath made; that is, Renewed Covenant with you. The Covenant at *Horeb*, and this in the Land of *Moab* was but one in Substance, though various in respect of the time, or manner of Administration. And indeed, they were both the same for Substance with that made with *Abraham* also, *Gen. 17. 7.* *I will be a God to thee, and to thy Seed after thee. Thou shalt therefore keep my Covenant, thou and thy Seed after thee.* So it was in the *Sinai* Covenant, *Exod. 19. 4, 5.* *You have seen (saith God) what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bore you on Eagles Wings, and brought you unto my self. Now therefore, if you will obey my voice indeed, and keep my Covenant, then ye shall be unto me a peculiar Treasure above all People.* So *Deut. 29. 2, 3, 4, &c.* *You have seen all that the Lord did before your Eyes in the land of Egypt, unto Pharaoh and all his Servants; and I have led you forty years in the Wilderness, that ye might know that I am the Lord your God.* *Vers. 9.* *Keep therefore the words of this Covenant, and do them, that ye may prosper in all that ye do.* You stand this day

all of you before the Lord your God, that thou shouldst enter into Covenant with the Lord thy God. Vers. 12. That he may establish thee to day for a People unto himself; and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath said unto thee, and as he hath sworn unto thy Fathers Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Vers. 13. So that here is no difference at all between the Covenant made with *Abraham*, and that made with *Israel* at Mount *Sinai*, and this with the same People in the Land of *Moab* also: For we cannot but see, that for Substance they do all of them exactly agree; onely, that at Mount *Sinai* was made with *Israel* at their first entrance into the Wilderness; that in the Land of *Moab* about forty years after, when they were just ready to enter *Canaan*: For since the greatest part of the Generation were then dead, with whom the Covenant was first made at *Sinai*, God thought fit to renew it with their Successors in the Land of *Moab*, additional unto, or beside that Covenant Transaction that had passed between him and their Fathers at *Sinai*.

“ But (say you) it may be observed, that the Sameness of some particular Good promised, and Duties commanded in this Covenant established with *Abraham*, and that made at Mount *Sinai*, cannot justly be interpreted a Revelation from God, that the Covenants are one and the same. There may be observed (say you) an Identity or Sameness both of

“ Good

“ Good promised, and Duties commanded,
 “ in the Covenant of Nature, and the Cove-
 “ nant of Grace, in sundry particulars; and
 “ yet the Covenants are not only distinct,
 “ but of quite different Natures and Tenours.
 And who doubts, (say I) but there may be
 observed an Indentity or Sameness of the
 Good promised in the Covenant of Nature,
 and the Covenant of Grace, and yet both
 these Covenants are not only distinct, but of
 quite different Natures and Tenours, the one
 being Absolute, the other Conditional. The
 one requiring perfect Obedience as the Con-
 dition of enjoying the Good therein contain-
 ed : The other promising to work that in us
 which before was required of us. But it is
 evident, that the forementioned Covenants
 did all of them exactly agree, and that both
 in respect of the Good promised, and Duties
 commanded also : For they did all of them
 require Perfect Obedience as the Condition of
 obtaining the Mercies therein promised,
 which may be justly interpreted as a Revela-
 tion from God, that they are for the Substance
 of them one and the same, there being no
 difference at all between them, onely in the
 time and manner of their Administration.
 And then, where lies the ground of
 your Confidence, when you say, *Pag. 105.*
 “ What can possibly be more plain?
 “ Who can with any pretence of Divine Re-
 “ velation, question, whether that Covenant

" made with *Abraham*, Gen. 17. 7. be the Old
 " Covenant, or the same with that made at Si-
 " nai, when the Lord himself denies, that
 " that Covenant made at Mount *Sinai*, was
 " made with *Abraham*, but evidently, and in
 " plain words distinguishes the one from the
 " other. These are your groundless

Pag. 106. Triumphs. " And (say you) that
 " which may yet further confirm
 " us, is, that the Scriptures every where speak
 " of the Covenant made with *Abraham* in the
 " Singular Number, and no where give the
 " least Intimation, that there were two Co-
 " venants, the one of which can possibly be
 " supposed to be the Covenant of Grace, and
 " the other the Old Covenant. These Argu-
 " ments (say you) are so plain that nothing
 " can be rationally Reply'd.

No! say I; doth not the Apostle plainly
 tell you, that there were *Two Covenants*; the
 one, the Covenant of Grace; the other, the
 Old Covenant, and that upon this very oc-
 casion, and in reference to *Abraham* himself?
Gal. 4. 22. &c. For it is written (saith he) that
Abraham had two Sons, the one by a Bondmaid,
the other by a Freewoman: But he who was of
the Bondwoman was born after the Flesh, but he
of the Freewoman was by Promise. Which things
are an Allegory: For these are the two Covenants;
the one from Mount Sinai, which gendereth to Bon-
dage; the other answereth to Jerusalem, that is
above, and is free, which is the Mother of us all.

Now,

Now, I pray, Sir, consider; Doth not the Apostle here plainly tell you, that there were *two Covenants*, the one a Legal Bondage Covenant; the other a Covenant of Gospel Liberty and Freedom; the one a Covenant of Works, the other of Grace; under the Allegory of *Hagar* and *Sarah*, *Ishmael* and *Isaac*. And was this Prophetical Instance brought forth in *Abraham's* Family, shewing the Nature and Method of God's future Dispensations towards his Off-spring, without any respect unto *Abraham* himself? Had he not two Sons, the one by a Bond-maid, the other by a Free-woman? And did not this serve to represent unto him the different Nature of the *two Covenants* that had been before made with *Himself*, as well as of the two fold Covenant God intended to make with his Seed after him? That God intended to make a two fold Covenant with his Seed after him, is evident, for what else is the meaning of the two Covenants the Apostle here speaks of; the one from *Mount Sinai* in *Arabia*; the other answering to *Jerusalem that is Above*? And why doth the Apostle tell us of this Allegory, concerning the two Covenants in *Abraham's* Family, but with reference to *Abraham* himself, as well as his Off-spring? Or why doth the same Apostle elsewhere inform us, That the *Promise that Abraham should be the Heir of the World, was not to him, or to his Seed through the Law, but through the Righteousness of Faith.*

And that if the Inheritance be of the Law, it is no more of Promise, but God gave it to Abraham by Promise: But with respect to the two fold Covenant made with Abraham himself, shewing, that the latter was that alone through which the Inheritance was to be derived unto him, as well as unto all his Spiritual Off-spring; though during the season thereunto appointed of the Father, both he and they were to be held under the Bondage of a Legal Covenant, Gal. 4. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

Sir, these Considerations are no cunning Shifts, or subtile Evasions; but plain, downright Scripture Truths, that carry their own Evidence with them, in reference to the matter before us. And thus much shall suffice by way of Answer to the first Branch of your Second Proposition. I shall now therefore proceed to the Second Branch; which in your *Right Method*, you call, your Third Proposition.

Prop. 3. That the Covenant mentioned, Gen. 17. 7. is the Covenant of Grace, that very Covenant, according unto which, all the Elect, always have been, still are, and shall be saved.

This, you say, hath been afore proved in some other Discourses, where the Reader will find these two Positions laid down and proved. First, *That this was a Covenant of Grace.* Secondly, *That it is the Covenant of Grace under which*

which Believers now are. The former of these Positions, (say you,) was proved by Four Arguments, the latter by Two. The Second of the former was taken from the Subject Matter of the main Promise of the Covenant; and that is; that God would be a God to *Abraham*, and to his Seed after him in their Generations. Now, (say you,) this Good, (the Subject Matter of this Promise,) being a Spiritual Good, can only be conveyed by the Covenant of Grace, and consequently this Covenant must needs be the Covenant of Grace. For the clearing up, and Evincing of which, you offer Two things.

First, That when this Promise is an Essential, or Constitutive, part of any Covenant, it doth Constitute a Mutual Relation between God and the Parties with whom the Covenant is made. And therefore it cannot possibly be made an Essential, or Constitutive, part of the Covenant of Works.

Secondly, That it is Impossible that God should lay in his Attributes, or Divine Perfections, as Pledges, that the Promises of this Covenant should not fail on his Part, were it a Covenant of Works.

By way of Reply unto all which, I must refer you to my *Answer* to Mr. *Flavell's* Third Argument, about the Covenant of Circumcision, before mentioned, in the First Part of this Discourse, P. 75. which being to the same purpose and effect with what you here

offer, and having there given, I hope, a sufficient and satisfactory Answer thereunto, it needs not here to be Repeated.

P. 121. " But, (saith Mr. *Whiston*,)
 " upon supposition of the truth

" of this former Position, the
 " Second will be more easily granted. Hence,
 " (saith he,) I used only Two Arguments to
 " prove it, both which were drawn from the
 " Discourse of the Apostle, *Gal. 3. 16, 17,*
 " 29. And they are both grounded upon
 " this supposition, that the Covenant the A-
 " postle there speaks of, and hath reference
 " unto, is this Covenant, Recorded *Gen. 17.*
 " 7. which I proved by the Tenour of the
 " Promise Constituting the Covenant said by
 " the Apostle to be Confirmed in Christ.
 " The Promise was to *Abraham* and his Seed:
 " So that the Covenant made with *Abraham*,
 " the Promises of which are to his Seed, or run
 " in this Tenour, *To thee, and to thy Seed,*
 " that must needs be the Covenant the Apo-
 " stle hath reference unto, and consequently
 " must necessarily be the Covenant of Grace,
 " under which Believers now are. And that
 " this Covenant, Recorded *Gen. 17. 7.* must
 " necessarily be this Covenant, I prove, be-
 " cause there is no other Covenant made
 " with *Abraham* that the Apostle can possibly
 " intend; the Promises of which are exprest
 " in those Terms, or run in that Tenour.
 " And unless any other Promise made to A-

" *brahim,*

" *brabam*, with reference to his Seed, exprest
 " in those Terms, *To thy Seed*, can be pro-
 " duced, we may, and necessarily must, con-
 " clude, that it is the Promise of this Cove-
 " nant that the Apostle hath a Reference un-
 " to, and intends. Which things, (saith
 " he,) being so exceeding plain, and carry-
 " ing such convincing Evidence along with
 " them, it may seem exceeding strange how
 " they can be gain-said by any.

Reply, By way of Answer hereunto, I
 shall first prove, that the Apostle, *Gal. 3.*
16. when he tells us, That *to Abraham and*
his Seed were the Promises made; he saith not,
unto Seeds, as of many, but as of one; and to thy
Seed, which is Christ; could not possibly refer
 to *Gen. 17. 7.*

Secondly, That there are several other
 Promises made to *Abraham* and his Seed, be-
 sides those mentioned, *Gen. 17. 7.* which are
 Express'd in those Terms, and run in that
 Tenour. *To thee, and to thy Seed.*

First, That the Apostle, *Gal. 3. 16.* could
 not possibly refer to *Gen. 17. 7.* is Evident,
 because the Promises there mentioned, were
 Expressly made unto Seeds, as of many; in
 direct opposition to what the Apostle Asserts,
 concerning the Promises of the Gospel Cove-
 nant. *He saith not, unto Seeds, as of many.*
Gen. 17. 7, 8. I will Establish my Covenant be-
tween me and thee, and thy Seed after thee, in
their Generations; plainly and expressly Plu-

ral. *And I will give to thee, and to thy Seed after thee, the Land wherein thou art a stranger, and I will be their God ;* still expressly in the Plural, and not in the Singular Number. And so runs the Obligation also, *Vers. 9. Thou shalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou and thy Seed after thee in their Generations.* Those words of the Apostle therefore, *Gal. 3. 16.* cannot possibly refer to the Promises contained in the Covenant of Circumcision, (as it hath been generally, though mistakingly imagined they do,) but must of necessity refer to that Evangelical Covenant first Recorded, *Gen. 12. 2, 3. I will make of thee a great Nation, and I will Bless thee, and make thy Name great, and thou shalt be a Blessing. And I will Bless them that Bless thee, and Curse him that Curseth thee. And in thee shall all the Families of the Earth be Blessed.* Which latter Promise is afterward more fully Explained, *Gen. 22. 18. And in thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be Blessed.* In which respect, well might the Apostle say, *That to Abraham and his Seed were the Promises made. He saith not, unto Seeds as of many, but as of one ; and to thy Seed, which is Christ.* For as it is manifest, that those Promises were made to *Abraham ;* I say, they were made to *Abraham,* and to *his Seed,* in the direct Design and Intendment of them : So it is as Evident as to what concerns his Seed, that those Gospel Promises can be understood, (as the Apostle speaks,) in no other sense but *as of one :* For

it is plain, that it is Christ alone that is the Inheriting Seed there spoken of; in whom God there Promiseth, that all the Nations of the Earth should be Blessed. To him therefore, all the Promises of the Gospel were first made, *Psal.* 89, 27, 28, 29. In him they are all, yea, and *Amen*, *2 Cor.* 1. 20 And from him alone are they to be communicated to all his Members, *Isa.* 49. 6, 8, 9. *John* 1. 16. & 6. 27. *Gal.* 3. 29.

And in this respect, it is yet further Observable, that as God Promiseth *Abraham*, *Gen.* 22. 18. that in his Seed should all the Nations of the Earth be Blessed; plainly speaking of Christ the Promised Seed: So in the Words just before, he was expressly told, *And thy Seed shall possess the gate of his Enemies.* Not their Enemies, but his Enemies: expressly in the Singular: Whereas the Promises, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8. are all expressly in the Plural Number. So that as the Apostle might justly say in reference to this Gospel Covenant, that to *Abraham* and his Seed were the Promises made, not a Single Promise only, but the Promises: So it is as Evident, that the Seed there spoken of, can be understood of none other than of Christ himself alone, to whom the Promises were made. And accordingly the Apostle having spoken as he doth, *Gal.* 3. 16. to give a convincing Evidence, that by the Seed he there speaks of, he intended Christ Personal, and not Mystical,
(as

(as some have dreamed,) he doth sufficiently explain his meaning in this respect, *Vers. 19.* where he tells us, That *the Law was added because of Transgressions, till the Seed should come to whom the Promise was made*; where it is Observable, that the Law, (that is, the *Mosaical Administration*,) is said to have been before the Seed was come, and was to have its Period then. Now if by the Seed, Christ be not to be understood Personally, but Mystically, for the Visible, or Invisible Church, (take which you will,) then the Law could not have been before the Seed: For God had his Church in the World from the beginning, and more especially in *Abraham's Family* 400 Years at least, before the Law was given by *Moses*, of which Christ was the Head, and they his Mystical Body. And so by this Interpretation, the Seed should have been before the Law, contrary to the Apostle, who makes the Law to have been before the Seed, and to have its Period when the Seed to whom the Promise was made was come. From all which it evidently appears, that the Apostle, *Gal. 3. 16.* could not possibly design, or intend, the Promises of the Covenant of Circumcision, Recorded *Gen. 17. 7.* but must of necessity refer to the Promises of the fore-mentioned, and fore Established Gospel Covenant.

Secondly,

Secondly, As it is manifest that the Promises mentioned, *Gen. 12. 2, 3. & 22. 16, 17, 18.* were made to *Abraham*, and to his Seed, in the direct design and intendment of them: So it is as Evident, that there are several other Promises made to *Abraham* and his Seed, besides those mentioned, *Gen. 17. 7.* which are exprest in those Terms, and run in that very Tenour, To thee, and to thy Seed. So it is to this purpose plainly exprest, *Gen. 12. 7. & 13. 15.*

And thus having cleared these Two Points: First, That the Apostle, *Gal. 3. 16.* could not possibly refer to *Gen. 17. 7.* but to that Evangelical Covenant before insisted on. Secondly, That there are several other Promises made to *Abraham* and his Seed, besides those mentioned. *Gen. 17. 7.* which are Exprest in those Terms, and run in that Tenour, To thee, and to thy Seed; where, by Seed, Christ himself is to be understood, from whom alone all the Blessings in Promise are to be derived unto all his Spiritual Off spring: Whereas the Promises, *Gen. 17. 7.* are plainly made unto *Abraham* and his Natural Posterity only. Upon the whole therefore, it clearly appears, that Mr. *Whiston* is extreamly mistaken to tell us as he doth,

“ That the Apostle, *Gal. 3. 16.* P. 126.
 “ hath Reference unto, and di-
 “ rectly intends the Promise, *Gen. 17. 7.*
 And as greatly is he mistaken, when he tells
 us,

us, " That there being no other Promise Re-
 " corded in Scripture, exprest in the same
 " Words, or running in the same Tenour,
 " To thee, and to thy Seed, that he can possibly
 " have Reference to, but only this, it will
 " hardly be questioned by any Man that is
 " not resolved to turn away his Ears from
 " Him that speaketh from Heaven, whether
 " that be the Promise referred unto, and in-
 " tended by the Apostle, or no? This, (saith
 " he,) I shall be bold to say, that this one
 " Testimony of the Apostle concerning this
 " Covenant, will bear the Weight laid upon
 " it, and will Evince to the Judgment of all
 " Men, whose Minds are not blinded with
 " Excess of Prejudice, the Infallible Certain-
 " ty, that the Covenant, *Gen. 17. 7.* is the
 " Covenant of Grace, let Men or Devils do
 " their utmost to Weaken it. God grant his
 Eyes may at last be opened to see his great
 Mistakes in these Respects.

To Conclude, Having gained your Three
 Main Posts, that is, having I hope substan-
 tially Answered and shewn you the Weakness
 of your Three forementioned Propositions,
 I shall not at all concern my self with the
 following Part of your Discourse: For, *De-
 bile Fundamentum fallit opus*, your Foundation
 being destroyed; all the Superstructure you
 have built thereon must of necessity totter.
 And so much your self acknowledg in your
 Epistle, where you tell the World, " That
 " the

e- "the Main Hinge of the Paedobaptistmal
 ne "Controversie turns upon the Covenant of
 ur, "Circumcision ; and, (say you,) could it
 ly "be proved, that that Covenant was the
 ill "Old Covenant, it must be granted, that
 is "the ground we lay to Infant's Covenant-In-
 m "terest and Baptism therein must needs fall ;
 er "and consequently the Claim we Bottom
 n- "thereupon must be acknowledged to be
 ith "Vain. Which, whether it be not now
 ne substantially performed, I shall submit unto
 his the Judgment and Determination of the
 on Church of God.

all • *POSTSCRIPT*, Though I intended here
 ith to have put a Period to this Discourse ; yet
 in- upon second thoughts I shall add a Word or
 he Two in Reference to your following Argu-
 do ment, P. 128. which you have thought fit to
 his add unto those foregoing, that you might, as
 eat you say, give your Opponents full measure
 ree heaped up and running over ; whereby you
 an- labour further to Prove, that the Covenant
 nefs of Circumcision is the Covenant of Grace ;
 ns. which you draw from the Nature of that
 the Covenant, as being the Rule of Admitting
 De- Members into the *Jewish* Church : From
 ion whence you Infer, that it must needs be the
 you Covenant of Grace ; forasmuch as by vertue
 cer. thereof, you suppose Jesus Christ, and they
 our came to have Communion and Fellowship
 hat with each other : Upon the whole therefore
 the of what you offer upon this Head, I shall on-
 ly

ly need to tell you ; That though it is evident and undeniable, that the Saints, or Elect of God, under the former Administration had Communion with Christ in the way of New Covenant Mercy : For else how were they Saved ? Yet that their Communion With Christ was not derived unto them through the Channel of the Covenant of Circumcision made with *Abraham*, or that made with *Israel* at Mount *Sinai*, I thus Prove,

Argum. 1. If the Covenant of Circumcision, and that at *Sinai*, were of that Nature, that though many were Justified that were under them ; yet none were ever Justified by them, or by vertue of them, then neither could they be the Medium of Communion with Christ in the way of New Covenant of Mercy : But it is Evident from the Scriptures, that though many were Justified, who were under these Covenants ; yet none were ever Justified by them, or by vertue of them, *Rom. 3. 20 Gal. 2. 16 & 5. 2, 3. Ergo,*

Argum. 2. If *Abraham's* Inheritance was not derived unto him, or to his Seed, through the Law, or through the Covenant of Circumcision ; which in effect is the same as hath been before proved ; then neither could his Communion with Christ in the way of New Covenant Mercy be derived unto him, or his Seed, through that Channel : But the Scripture is Express, that the Promise, that he should be the Heir of the World, was not to *Abraham*, or to his Seed, through the Law, but through the Righteousness of Faith, *Rom. 4. 13. Ergo,*

Argum. 3. That Covenant, through which had the Inheritance been conveyed, would have made Faith void, and the Promise to be of none effect, could not possibly be the Medium of Intercourse with Christ in the way of New Covenant Mercy : But the Scripture is Express ; that if they which are of the Law be Heirs, Faith is made void ; and the Promise of none effect, *Rom. 4. 14. Ergo,*

The E N D.

deni-
former
ay of
Yet
unto
mcifi-
Mount

that at
ustifi
ed by
oe the
w Co-
, that
Cove-
vertue

erived
gh-the
me as
mmu-
be de-
ut the
be the
Seed,
Faith,

Inhe-
nd the
e Me-
Cove-
f they
; and

John 1:12

John 1:12